

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DAV WORKS FOR BETTER GOVERNMENT

HON. PAUL W. CRONIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Speaker, the DAV is an organization that has long worked for better government and toward solutions for veterans' problems. Particularly in Massachusetts, the DAV is recognized for providing leadership, not only among veterans, but the community as well. It is an organization that has brought pride to the citizens of our State.

An outstanding member of the Massachusetts Disabled Veterans is also a resident of the Fifth Congressional District. Mr. Frank Cain, who resides in Lawrence, Mass., is presently serving as State Commander of the Massachusetts DAV. Mr. Cain, a World War II veteran, saw action in Australia, New Guinea, the Admiralty Islands, Howie Island, Manila, and Japan. Frank joined the DAV in 1945 and is now a life member of the Queen City Chapter No. 2. He has filled a number of positions ably during his membership, including in 1972 and 1973, the position of membership chairman of the Massachusetts Department of Disabled American Veterans. During these years the DAV obtained the largest membership in its history.

Frank Cain is a notable member of an organization that serves its community well. I take this opportunity to commend him for his fine service and to thank him on behalf of his community.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to include a copy of the program for Frank's installation for the RECORD. I believe it will serve as an indication of the feeling that the people of Massachusetts have for our State DAV Commander.

TESTIMONIAL BANQUET FOR STATE COMMANDER AND MRS. FRANK A. CAIN

INVITED GUESTS

Leo V. Allaire, Banquet Chairman, Commander Queen City No. 2.

Reverend Carl E. Bergstrom, Department Chaplain, DAV.

Laurence U. Bloom, Senior Vice Commander, DAV.

Clara C. Bowers, 4th National Junior Vice Commander, DAV Aux.

Honorable John J. Buckley, Mayor, City of Lawrence.

Mr. & Mrs. Richard Cain.

Honorable Paul W. Cronin, Member of Congress.

Florence E. Daley, Nat. Ex. Committee-woman, DAV Aux.

Honorable John F. X. Davoren, Secretary of State, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Alfred Donovan, Alderman, City of Lawrence, Director of Public Safety.

Mrs. Alfred Donovan.

Walter T. Greaney, National Senior Vice Commander, DAV.

Joseph A. Kane, Representing Gov. Francis W. Sargent.

Honorable Thomas Lane, Governor's Counselor, Lawrence.

Robert Lippe, Alderman, City of Lawrence, Director, of Health & Charities.

Mrs. Robert Lippe.

Joseph Markey, Alderman, City of Lawrence, Director of Engineering.

Mrs. Joseph Markey.

Henry W. Pepin, Past Commander Queen City No. 2, Toastmaster.

Robert S. Redding, National Executive Committeeman, DAV.

Richard Reming, Alderman, City of Lawrence, Director of Property and Parks.

Mrs. Richard Reming.

Mary T. Silva, State Commander, DAV Auxiliary.

Mr. Charles Silva.

Peter Smith, Headmaster, Lawrence High School, Lawrence.

Mrs. Peter Smith.

Honorable William X. Wall, State Senator, Lawrence.

Honorable David B. Williams, Presiding Justice, Ayer District Court and Past National Commander, DAV.

PROGRAM

Invocation, Reverend Carl E. Bergstrom, Department chaplain.

National Anthem.

Welcome, Leo V. Allaire, Banquet Chairman, Commander, Queen City 2, DAV.

Introduction of Head Table Guests, Henry W. Pepin, Toastmaster.

Greeting, John J. Buckley, Mayor of Lawrence.

Principal speaker, Paul W. Cronin, U.S. Congressman.

Introduction, guest of honor, Frank A. Cain, Department commander.

Queen City Chapter No. 2 acknowledges the many good wishes, your presence here suggests, in honoring Frank A. Cain, Department Commander. May we take this opportunity to extend to you on behalf of Frank and the Disabled American Veterans, our sincere hope for your every success and continued good health.

FRANK A. CAIN

Frank A. Cain, employed in the Lawrence School Department as Supervisor of Attendance, presently serving as the State Commander of the Massachusetts Disabled American Veterans, resides in Lawrence at 16 Plummer Road.

He is a graduate of St. Patrick's School, Lawrence High School, and a World War II veteran.

Serving with the U.S. Army First Cavalry Division, his overseas service included Australia, New Guinea, Admiralty Islands, Howie Island, Samoa, Tacloban, Leyte, Manila, and Japan.

He is a Life Member of Queen City Chapter No. 2 having joined the DAV in 1945. He has served as Chapter Commander and Adjutant, is active in District Council No. 4, and is a former member and Chairman of the Department Finance Committee and the Department Auditing Committee.

He is married to the former Marie O'Carroll of Lawrence.

In 1972 and 1973 as the Membership Chairman of the Department of Massachusetts, the Disabled American Veterans obtained the largest membership in its history.

THANKS

To the members of Queen City Chapter No. 2, to the D.A.V. Auxiliary and to the Department Officers for their assistance. Leo V. Allaire, Chairman, Banquet Committee.

SAVANNAH'S CATHEDRAL OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST CELEBRATES 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF LAYING OF CORNERSTONE

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on November 18, Savannah's Cathedral of St. John the Baptist celebrated the 100th anniversary of the laying of its cornerstone. This cathedral is one of the most beautiful church edifices in the South.

The clergy and laity of the cathedral are justifiably proud of the work they and their forebears have done to make this one of the truly outstanding parishes in the country.

The cathedral parish made Savannah the first cathedral city in Georgia in 1850, and has its roots in colonial times. One of its early parishioners was Capt. Denis Cottineau, who commanded a vessel in John Paul Jones' squadron in the famed naval engagement between the *Bon Homme Richard* and the *Serapis*.

Bishop Raymond Lessard of Savannah celebrated the centennial mass, while the Rev. Lawrence Lucree, a former cathedral rector and native son of Savannah and its cathedral, delivered the homily.

I ask unanimous consent that a history of the parish from the Savannah News-Press be printed in the RECORD as an extension of my remarks.

There being no objection, the history was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORY OF CATHEDRAL OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

(By Ann Marshall)

It was bitter cold at 3 p.m. Nov. 19, 1873 when 6,000 citizens gathered in the vicinity of Abercorn and Harris Streets to see the laying of a cornerstone for the Roman Catholic Cathedral of St. John the Baptist.

Presiding at the service to dedicate the marble stonework before temporary outdoor altar at the east end of the building outline—approximately where the high altar would rise—was Bishop W. H. Gross of Savannah.

Bishop James Gibbons of Richmond, Va., from a temporary pulpit.

The service ended after his address with three cheers for the speaker, followed by three cheers for Bishop Gross.

Today, parishioners, their friends, well-wishers, and community officials are gathering at the cathedral for a 100th anniversary service at 10 a.m. to commemorate that lively cornerstone ceremony.

It will be the first time that Bishop Raymond W. Lessard celebrates a Latin High Mass in the cathedral.

To preach, he has designated the Rev. Lawrence A. Lucree, who was cathedral pastor before being transferred to Albany and later to Jesup where he is rector of St. Joseph's Church.

The Savannah Morning News of Nov. 20, 1873 spread the story of the cornerstone ceremony, the history of Roman Catholics in

Savannah, details of the cathedral fund drive, architectural plans for the cathedral, and a list of the contents of a box placed in the cornerstone, in six columns in fine print—some two thirds of its "editorial" page.

The writer described a long procession which formed at Bull and South Broad Streets, north on Whitaker to Bay, east to Lincoln and south to South Broad (Oglethorpe Avenue today) thence to Abercorn and Harris.

The crowd which followed the procession swelled the crowd waiting at the site.

"The fences and residences in the view of the ground were thronged with people, and the southern side of the Academy of St. Vincent de Paul, which overlooks the foundation, presented a picture of living female beauty. Even the roof of this building was crowded with ladies," said the account in the newspaper.

Alighting from their carriages and walking chairs on the building site with the two bishops were 15 clergymen. They came from Canada, Charleston, S.C., Augusta, Macon and Savannah.

JASPER GREENS

Brightly uniformed Jasper Greens mounted the parapet surrounding the entire foundation and acted as a "chain picket guard." Crowded into the enclosure were uniformed members of the 18 Irish societies.

They had walked in the procession led by the Hibernian Brass Band, with the Washington Coronet Band at mid-point.

Each group carried banners which they stationed at either side of the altar, adding a gala note in the open air "sanctuary."

Bishop Gross blessed the white cornerstone with holy water before it was borne to the southwest corner.

The box of gifts was put in it and the stone lowered into place. The clerical procession then moved slowly around the enclosure with the bishop as he sprinkled holy water on the walls.

Bishop Gibbons opened his talk with a quotation from the Psalmist: "The heavens declare the glory of the Lord, and the firmament announces the work of his hands."

He went on to describe the "cathedral" formed by the world and the universe before Solomon built the first temple. He noted the first Christian church built in the third century by Constantine the Great, the first Christian emperor of Rome.

"Under the aegis of this same religious toleration we are assembled here today," he continued, noting he saw various nationalities represented in the crowd: sturdy Germans, sons of Ireland, children of Sunny France and Italy.

"And I was also glad to witness in the procession the representatives of the African races fraternizing harmoniously with those who had been their former masters," said Bishop Gibbons.

DIOCESE OF RICHMOND

He noted members of other denominations there. Then he praised the "liberality" of Savannah people who formerly contributed to the erection of churches in other dioceses, including his own Diocese of Richmond.

"In other countries churches have been erected by crowned heads and jeweled princesses, but our reliance is on the generous hearts of the people," he said.

Clergy and laymen contributed coins and mementoes for the cornerstone box. M. T. Quinan put in \$60 in Continental ship plasters dated Jan. 14, 1779. John Rcurke laid in a Russian copper coin 200 years old.

Turf from the bogs of Mayo, Ireland; clay from the grave of St. Comm in Mays, Ireland; a piece of tow brought by Bishop Gartland—Savannah's first bishop—from the College of All Hallows, Ireland; and antique French, English, Prussian, Chinese,

CXIX—2457—Part 30

Dutch, Danish and Spanish coins were the gift of Mrs. Catherine Flynn.

James D. Reynolds added a piece of stone from St. Saviour's Dominican Catholic Church in Dublin laid in 1853 by Cardinal Cullen. The rules of Savannah City Council went in from Hon. E. C. Anderson and A. B. Luce and Mrs. M. S. Raymur put in the day's menus from Marshall House hotel on Broughton Street.

It was April 30, 1876 when the completed structure costing \$150,000 was dedicated, and 1896 when the bell tower steeples were added by Bishop Thomas A. Becker at additional cost of \$35,000. Bishop Becker in 1889 built the cathedral rectory where the pastor Msgr. Daniel Bourke, his assistants, and Bishop Lessard live.

The cathedral was gutted by fire Feb. 6, 1898. The congregation celebrated the first mass in the rebuilt structure on Sunday morning of Christmas Eve, 1899. It was dedicated Oct. 28, 1900.

Since then, the exterior and interior have been renovated several times.

Monsignor Bourke said this week he hopes to complete another renovation before the 100th anniversary celebration in 1976 which will be a highlight of the Roman Catholic community's contribution to Savannah's Bicentennial '76.

CLUB COMANCHE—25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, during the past year, the national press has been publishing stories on some tragic episodes that have disrupted the peaceful nature of St. Croix, V.I. Unfortunately, many people who are unfamiliar with the traditional nature of our Island society and culture have developed their image of St. Croix solely from these articles. For the edification of these individuals and any colleagues who have not had the opportunity to visit the Virgin Islands, I will be entering in the RECORD a series of profiles of Virgin Islanders and their activities.

My responsibility and intention are to provide a balanced view of St. Croix to counteract the unintentionally biased coverage of island life. My colleagues who have seen the Virgin Islands will recognize the true representation of my home that these articles depict.

Today I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the 25th anniversary celebration of Club Comanche, a hotel in Christiansted, St. Croix. Ted Dale and Guy Reynolds, coowners of the club, have been friends of mine for years. They personify the best in those people who have transplanted themselves to the Virgin Islands. Their contributions to the Crucian community are innumerable. I only regret that I could not join in their 25th anniversary celebration because of pressing duties in Washington.

The intensity of this celebration demonstrates the real spirit of human relations on St. Croix. Old and young, black and white, native and mainlanders united in true community spirit and joy to com-

memorate the anniversary of this traditional Virgin Island meeting place.

The article from the November 18 edition of the Pulitzer Prize winning newspaper, the San Juan Star, published on the neighboring island of Puerto Rico, follows:

ST. CROIX CELEBRATES WITH CLUB COMANCHE (By Freck Hart)

CHRISTIANSTED, ST. CROIX, V.I.—The Horsford Family Scratch-Band of St. Croix could have played a rousing chorus of a catchy tune that begins "Accentuate the positive," for that is what was happening as a colorful Christiansted caravansary called Club Comanche celebrated its 25th anniversary last Sunday, Nov. 11.

Around 1,000 Crucians, continentals who now call St. Croix home and mainlanders who "headquarter" at the well-known hotel gathered at midday for the lively occasion that marked the beginning in 1948 of what was to become legend and landmark. Guests sipped and supped and recalled good times. "Remember when?" was the order of the day as old friends swapped Club Comanche stories. Concerns that have come with unaccustomed violence in the community—were forgotten with accounts such as the one of the arrival of already famous photographer Fritz Henle and a bevy of fashion models. Hundreds of sailors and Marines converged on Club Comanche at the same time. There were more spirits than solid sustenance in the hotel larder, which resulted in confusion for some. A sailor did not know port from starboard and when directed left and left went right and right wound up in the swimming pool. A dripping young man warned every one that the hotel's head was flooded.

Club Comanche is a place of laughter. The sprawling, hodge-podge hotel, which reaches from the inland side of Christiansted's first street parallel to shoreline, has been known for its conviviality and hospitality since its doors opened a quarter century ago.

Hospitality was in evidence at all levels Sunday, reaching from orchid gardens behind the main building to the replica of sugar mill tower in the harbor.

Those who came to share the fun included every one from the Virgin Islands Governor to the man in charge of street cleaning.

Gov. and Mrs. Melvin H. Evans flew in from St. Thomas on the "Goose" for the occasion. Capt. Charles Blair left the party to board one of the Antilles Airboats, taking a turn at piloting one of his seaplanes. An eye-catching sight at poolside was his wife, famous flaming redheaded actress Maureen O'Hara, being serenaded by a jaunty flautist called "Dutchy" Leonardo. The little man made liting music for all.

Puerto Rican Julia Gomez Armstrong pointed out many islanders in the crowd, some rarely seen at public gatherings, she said. There was Annie de Chabert, Ulric Benjamin, the Neltrhopp family, the Hodges, the Dowdards, the Davids, the Roebucks, the Morales family and the Espanza sisters. Also there were Judge Almeric Christian and Judge Warren Young, who was on the bench during Fountain Valley trial. There, too, was former chief of immigration Otto Latimer, now retired.

Dr. Andre Joseph and his wife, Dr. Jutta Joseph, who came with their children—Andre Jr., Jutta, Waldo and Michelene. There was hospital nurse Joyce Rohlsen and her children, Michele and Henry Jr., and Beverly Rohlsen, public health nurse, and young Eryle.

Then there were dozens of guests who came down to St. Croix especially for the anniversary party. Mr. and Mrs. Donald V. Kane of Long Island, who now have a St. Croix vacation home, flew in for the occasion and took some teasing from one of their five children, Mary Beth, about being jet setters. John Wol-

forth, who has been coming to Club Comanche for 21 years, also flew in from Long Island. Marilyn Miklos of New York City said she had never made such a long journey for such a short stay. State Sen. William Clark of Oklahoma, who has been in Christiansted often of late, returned for the party.

The hotel's very first guests, Lee Platt, and his sister, Mrs. Tom King, now an island resident, were among arrivals. So was Alphonso Sebastian Forbes, who sold the Grand street site to Club Comanche owners, Ted Dale and Guy Reynolds.

Co-owner Dale's wife, Betty, greeted guests and pointed to detailed party directory that had been posted on the hotel's Front Porch.

The more conservative moved toward the garden just off the Club Comanche's Back Porch, where Eleanor Brumenschenkel served tea and showed off 2,000 orchids she and her husband, Jim, have collected. Those who desired a different brew got one from the Dale's son, Gordon, who was stationed on the Back Porch. His sister, Margot ("Muffin"), served finger foods.

Most guests crossed the bridge over Grand street to be greeted by Guy and Anita Reynolds at the Club Comanche Pavillion Restaurant, now run by Dick and Mary Boehm on lease arrangement.

Some settled down there for shad, corn fritters and cocktails by Rico. Others continued to Swimming Pool Terrace, where Honor Richardson was dispensing rum from giant keg. Trays of shark balls were being passed. These spicy delicacies were being prepared at a food center at sea level boat basin. Cecil Simmonds was spooning a mixture of shark meat, onions, peppers, tomato sauce and cracker meal into old-fashioned iron frying pans.

There was also roast pig prepared by Bill Rose, fish smoked by Bob Finucane and goat roasted by Roy Joseph.

It was a West Indian feast, and the genial Dale was making sure that guests were having fun and getting their fill. He had posted veteran employees at the main entrance to Club Comanche to direct guests to festivities.

Club Comanche, as colorful as it is, is best known for its key people. Crucian Catherine Golden was among the first to join the staff. Dale said, "I hired her when she was 16, going to see her father as if I were asking for her hand."

Others who have been at Club Comanche for years and years include Marilyn Tutein, Roderick (Big Duke) Verderver, Karen Christiansen and Leona Daniels.

Many people identify with Club Comanche. Sam and Pam Wilson feel close because they met and married and honeymooned there. They now live on St. Croix.

Most of the guests associate the Club Comanche with the nautical and feel that the Club Comanche story is incomplete without salt.

The owners arrived in St. Croix aboard a venerable old yawl that Philadelphia Dale acquired after leaving the Navy at the end of World War II. Dale and Reynolds dropped anchor, saw and bought No. 1 Grand and forgot their original destination on Antigua. They kept the Comanche and used the yawl for hauling building supplies from San Juan for the island's third hotel.

The Comanche finally got the sags and was burned. The keel was kept, however, and is at Pull Point, the Dales' unusual cliff-hanging home.

Called a reincarnated Viking, Dale remained interested in boats and sailing. He talked a Club Comanche guest, John "Corn-cob" Gorham, into going with him to Surinam to have native canoes hollowed out of huge logs. Dale, who is actively involved in all kinds of island sports programs including wrestling and softball, wanted young Crucians to learn crew racing.

He also had a yen to try long range sailing in dugout. He outfitted one with three Sail-

fish sails and began lining up buddies of like mind for long hauls. He dubbed the dugout "Affabakka". Crewmen for the canoe changed from time to time, but Corn-cob, Ingemar Gustavsson and Doug Cochran, lawyer who was at Naval flying school with Dale, go when there's a chance.

They sailed the first canoe each year for five years, touching all the down islands and getting as far as Colombia, Panama and the San Blas Islands.

These were far from plush journeys but they had distinct advantages, Dale says. "There was no engine to fail, no toilet to stop up and no bilge pump to jam."

There were disadvantages. Corn-cob says, "The canoe was 40 feet by four. It sleeps four but only two at a time."

Food came from tins, and menus were mix-ups. Labels on cans kept coming off.

All four men have remained close friends through six canoe trips and one raft trip up the Magdalena River in Colombia. They have had no trips since they left the successor to first sailing canoe in Jamaica. They ran into foul weather and were without rudder or jib.

For old times sake, some of the crew had a pre-party canoe trip in the wee hours before the party began. They good-humoredly reported on soggy ending as they had breakfast, with one asking for a long glass of water and other asking for coffee "blessed" by Jonesy. Club Comanche's Jones pours black coffee spiked with Cruzan rum.

There was talk at the time of looking up a quotation from Tennyson's "Ulysses" to salute their captain, Dale, at the Club Comanche celebration.

This plan was forgotten as fellow sailors decided to maneuver the "Viking" into the hotel's swimming pool. This accomplished to the applause of nearly 1,000 guests, they tossed in a sign made by artist Ruth Snavoe for the anniversary. It read:

"Still plenty alive
"At twenty-five-
"Hearty and hale
"Reynolds and Dale"

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY JAMES C. WHEAT TO CORPS OF CADETS, VIRGINIA MILITARY INSTITUTE

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, James C. Wheat, chairman of the board, Wheat, First Securities, Inc. of Richmond, Va., delivered an inspiring address to the Corps of Cadets at the Virginia Military Institute on November 12.

I want to share this address with my colleagues in the Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the RECORD.

Mr. Wheat is an outstanding Virginian, a graduate of the Virginia Military Institute, and one whose contributions to his fellow citizens have been many.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY JAMES CLIFTON WHEAT, JR.

General Irby, General Shepherd, Mr. Edmondson, Mr. Gilliam, Mr. Turman, Gentlemen of the Corps, friends and family of VMI: I am privileged to participate in this 134th anniversary of the founding of the Institute. In those 134 years, this great institution has made contributions far beyond its number of graduates to the well-being and enrich-

ment of the lives of millions and millions of people throughout this world.

If I may indulge in a personal expression, as one of those whose lives has been enriched, I wish to express my gratitude to the Institute and to those noble, patient, and often forbearing gentlemen, such as Colonel Son Read, Buck Weaver, Herbert Dillard, Sam Millner, Sam Heflin, and many many others. I believe it can be truthfully said that the man who finishes four years here gets an education in spite of himself, even if he tries not to. I know this was unfortunately true in my case, and I wish I had taken advantage of the opportunities here presented to a greater extent than I did as a cadet, but enough of self-recrimination.

As I think back, today is really an auspicious time for me. Some thirty-six years ago, I was "introduced" in Club Crozet to a gentleman at a table, but thirty days later I remembered his name—his name was Rawls. Over the intervening thirty-six years, it has been my ambition to have Rawls sit and listen to me like I had to listen to him. Today is my chance, but I promise you I will not take it all out on you.

Recently, I read a little pamphlet which I recommend to you, as a point of departure, for this thing that has suddenly hit the front pages and which is known as the energy crisis. It is well-done. It is done in layman's language, and I think it is something we all should recognize as a problem for us as a nation and as a group of individuals. The subject is one to which we should address considerable attention.

However we may be disposed to think of the so-called energy crisis, I for one do not consider it a crisis. And I think that if you will read any material on this subject, you will probably come to the same conclusion. The crisis really arises in that we haven't done our homework and haven't done our planning. This is not a crisis of energy. This is a crisis of thinking and of people. We do have a problem, and it is well for us to consider it and not sweep it under the rug. The problem is not as presented, however, as I indicated. The problem is that we haven't really focused in on what is the nature of the problem and what can be done about it.

Certainly, there is no lack of energy when you consider that Divine Providence every day, through the rays of the sun, puts on one square mile of land the energy equivalent to a 100-megawatt electrical installation. Or put another way, on 2,500 square miles the sun places energy equal to the total electrical generation in the United States today. In view of such circumstances, we cannot say that we have a lack of energy available to us. Likewise, we have tremendous resources in other directions: coal, oil, and as yet undiscovered, tremendous resources of energy. So, I do not believe that we can truly say this is a crisis of energy. There is plenty of energy available. It is up to man to develop this energy, to see that it is properly handled and distributed, and avoid engaging in some of the past practices that we have, in which we actually dissipate energy through fallacious economic practices, such as the forced sale of natural gas at ridiculous levels, or where we engage in the use of national objectives, such as antipollution, to the detriment of our basic energy requirements.

In reading this pamphlet and, more importantly, reflecting upon it after reading it, it brought home to me three basic conclusions: First, we are going to solve the so-called energy crisis. Of this I have no concern, whatsoever. We are going to solve it. Any nation that can do what this nation has done in so many areas of physical endeavor can do this, and it will be done. Secondly, I see in this a positive force in that maybe it will reach us as individuals. A little sacrifice, a little tough going never hurts us, and particularly at a time like this, we need to be reminded that we are dependent upon a whole lot of things besides ourselves. Finally,

I think it can serve a very constructive force in bringing us together again in this nation and, hopefully, it will at least replace this masochistic experience we are going through known as Watergate.

To me the real crisis, if there is a crisis in the field of energy, lies potentially in our failure to recognize not the limits of the physical resources, but in failing to recognize the impact and contribution upon energy resources that the human being makes. This is the most important energy resource in this world: the individual human being—mind, body, and spirit. I think that the relationship of the body of man and the mind of man to energy resources is pretty apparent. Man has been chopping wood, plowing fields, lifting objects for, lo, these millions of years. Likewise, the mind of man has been the cause of better utilization of prevailing energy sources for the better life, the creation of new energy sources, and the location of new energy sources. The mind and body of man are, in fact, the beginning and the end of energy and its utilization. In the final analysis, we—you and I—are the ultimate vehicles for delivery of the work that energy enables us to perform. So, I say that the mind and body of the human being as a source of energy, I think, are well-accepted and pretty obvious.

Less obvious, but probably of greater importance, I believe is the spirit of man. I have told this story many, many times, and I hope that those of you who have had to endure me over the years in some other places will forgive me for repeating it. But it made an impression on me at the time, it has made it over the years, and it continues to make an impression upon me when I need perspective. And let's face it, we all need perspective as we go through this journey we call life. Because life is not made to be easy. It never has been and, in my judgment, it never will be. But what is required to make this journey is that capacity which Winston Churchill attributed to General George Marshall when he said he was always victorious over defeatism, discouragement and disillusion. And these are the enemies of mankind. These are the opposites of human energy, human ability, and human performance.

This story has to do with a young man I grew up with in Richmond who had just about everything that the book would say is ideal. He was well-educated, good-looking, a whale of an athlete, had a great personality, and was a natural leader. In every respect, everything was his way. Early in 1942, he developed a form of multiple sclerosis and began to go downhill from that point. I was here at the time teaching in the Civil Engineering Department and went home for a weekend. In 1944, I guess it was. And I went out to a gathering that we all put together at the old Bon Air Community House. This particular young man was there, and at that time he was beginning to have trouble moving around. He saw me across the room. We hadn't seen one another for three or four years, and he shuffled across the room to me, greeted me, and we began chatting. I knew of his problem, and I said, "Junie, let me get you a chair." He said, "No, Wheat, I'll just lean against this wall. Don't worry about me; everybody has something." This made an impression on me then, as I say, and it comes back to me everytime I get to feeling sorry for myself about business conditions or any other conditions.

Everybody has something. This recognition of the toughness of life, of the demands of life, without surrender to it, to me is the maximum expression of human energy, the energy of the spirit. Mr. Shakespeare expresses it in those great lines:

Sweet are the uses of adversity,
Which, like the toad, ugly and venomous,
Wears yet a precious jewel in his head.
And this our life exempt from public haunt

Finds tongues in trees, books in the running
brooks,

Sermons in stones, and good in everything.
I would not change it.

(As You Like It, II, i. 12-18).

This to me is our challenge, day-in, day-out. This is our source of energy, day-in, day-out. In less classical terms, "When the going gets tough, the tough get going." This to me is what we here at VMI are exposed to day-by-day, whether we resist it or not—as some of us have, and some of us do, and some of us will. This is what is instilled in us, and this is why I firmly believe that this institution will continue to make the great contribution, a contribution far beyond its numbers. Not that we are any better or any worse; we are just flesh and blood, guts and gristle. But this system does work, gentlemen; it does work.

I think that all of us are prone to think that our time in history is probably the most difficult. Certainly, this is a difficult time, but it is also a highly rewarding time, a highly stimulating time. We have our problems; they are now known as crises. We had at one time this week, I think, the Watergate crisis, the Middle East crisis, and the energy crisis, but I would remind you that ten years ago in this land a President was killed. Twenty years ago this country was at war fighting to defend another nation. Thirty years ago it was fighting to defend the world and itself. Forty years ago it was coming out of the midst of the worst economic depression in history. So, problems and trials are nothing new to anybody. They are not new to you, they are not new to me, and they are not going to be new to our children. The question is how we face them, and this is this mystical ingredient of human energy known as spirit.

Perhaps you have heard this story—I never had—which I think sums it up. Winston Churchill late in life was asked to appear at a boys' school. And when the old gentleman was called on to speak, obviously the headmaster and the masters and the young men expected to hear words of history and philosophy and a great dissertation from this probably greatest of contemporary men. The old gentleman stood up and his message was very simple. He looked at these young boys, and his message was: "Never give in. Never give in. Never. Never. Never."

This is our eternal challenge, gentlemen and ladies, for the spirit of man. This is our eternal challenge: Never give in.

RIVER FALLS, WIS., ACTS TO CONSERVE ENERGY

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, each of us will have to make sacrifices in order to overcome the present energy crisis and fuel shortages this winter. The businessmen of River Falls, Wis., in the Third Congressional District, deserve a warm round of applause for their forthright, collective response to the problem. They have decided to cut back the electrical consumption in their stores by one-fourth to one-half, end all outside lighting, reduce heating to 65 to 68 degrees, cut the lighting of downtown's Main Street by one-half, limit Christmas lights to 4 hours on Christmas Eve and Christmas night and conduct a public education cam-

paign to encourage private citizens to join in the energy conservation effort. River Falls is setting a good example for communities everywhere.

I include at this point in the RECORD, a statement issued by the retail trade members of the River Falls Chamber of Commerce:

RIVER FALLS CHAMBER OF COM-
MERCE, INC.

River Falls, Wis.

CITY COUNCIL,
City Hall,
River Falls, Wis.

Twenty-six members of the Retail Trade of the River Falls Chamber of Commerce of River Falls, Wisconsin held a meeting at 12 noon at the Hotel Walvern on November 12, 1973 and by unanimous decision the following proclamation was made by this group.

As a group we will cut our electricity by one-fourth to one-half in all the stores. This will include outside lights to be off entirely when feasible, no window lights on if not absolutely necessary. All stores will cut the heating down to 65° to 68° where they have control of their own thermostats. The lights on Main Street shall be cut in half if this is feasible. They will have a meeting of the Council, Utility Commission and businessmen in the very near future to try different ways to cut down on the street lighting. There will be no Christmas lights on any of the store fronts and the City decorations are to go up as usual but the lights will not be turned on. The only exception to this would be a possibility of turning the lights on for 4 hours no Christmas Eve and 4 hours on Christmas night if the lighting is not critical at that time. We as a group will abide by the need for any limit of store hours during or after Christmas relative to the store hours of surrounding communities including the metropolitan area. The Chamber will order stickers for all the stores to display with the following message, "We are conserving energy—Won't you help too?" The group will do all it can to get the message of how critical the need is now to the entire town for conserving fuel, lights and push for the 50 M.P.H. speed limit.

CONSTRUCTIVE CHILDREN'S PROGRAMMING

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest television programs for young children is Ladybug's Garden, an educational and entertainment series independently produced in Syracuse, N.Y., and seen on a number of stations throughout the East.

At a time when we can be justly critical of some of the material offered for young people through such a persuasive medium as television, the relatively few bright spots on the screen deserve our recognition, and Ladybug's Garden merits this attention. Educators and parents have been responsive, and the program has received a number of distinguished awards. These citations have been eloquent in their praise.

I was particularly impressed when Ladybug's Garden initiated a 4th of July Create and Color Celebration this year, asking young viewers to write an origi-

inal short story or poem and to draw a picture illustrating their personal concept of patriotism. The objective was to stimulate an awareness of patriotism, and to encourage creativity in expressing positive thoughts about our country.

There were thousands of entries, and the wholesomeness and confidence they showed are an inspiration. Judged best of all was a poem and drawing submitted by Leonard Caruso, the 9-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. Nicola Caruso of 122 Fireside Lane, Camillus, N.Y., which is part of the 33d District.

Leonard's drawing shows a sturdy tree, with 50 leaves, each leaf representing and identified as one of the 50 great States of this Nation, and alongside is printed his fine poem which I am proud to share with you:

My country protects me
Just like a tree
The trunk is so sturdy
Like a government should be
The branches reach out
To all 50 States
The leaves offer shelter
And gives me a place
To live in freedom
No matter what I face
The fruit is the happiness
I feel just to know
That I am an American
And here is where I'll grow.

NATIONAL FARM WIFE MONTH

HON. JESSE A. HELMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, today, of course, is the last day of November, 1973, a month that was designated by Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz as "National Farm Wife Month."

I have heretofore commended Secretary Butz for this formal, yet sincere, recognition of ladies who too often are not given the recognition they deserve. I hope that, during this month, more Americans have been reminded of the great contributions the farm wife makes constantly to the success of American agriculture and, therefore, the greatness of America as well.

Farmers are, without doubt, the backbone of America's economy. Moreover, as a group, they best represent traditional American virtues. Their values, their individual achievement through hard work, and their strong belief in God and family are ideals that made this Nation great. America's farmers have given this Nation undisputed world leadership in agriculture, a position that has allowed us to implement policies of world leadership on behalf of freedom.

The role of the farm wife, as a partner to her husband in agricultural accomplishment, and in moral leadership for America, has too often been overlooked. Few farmers could operate effectively without the assistance and inspiration of their wives. I am pleased that this opportunity has been taken to salute America's farm wives, to recognize their role in American life, and—in this season of Thanksgiving—to have expressed our

gratitude for what they have meant to our Nation.

USES OF BLACKMAIL

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress considers the response that should be made to the Arab oil boycott, I would like to share with my colleagues a suggestion outlined by William F. Buckley, Jr. in an editorial entitled the "Uses of Blackmail." It is imperative that we deal firmly with those who resort to illegal, hostile activities in order to get their way, and I endorse Mr. Buckley's suggestion that we embargo shipments of U.S. goods and materials to those Arab Nations which have participated in the oil boycott. I hope that our European allies will also have the opportunity to read and ponder Mr. Buckley's comments.

The text of his editorial follows:

USES OF BLACKMAIL

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

It is said, here and there openly but for the most part in whispers, that the disadvantages of our Mideast position are gravely damaging to us, and that as the results of the oil embargo begin to hit us, the public will rise in wrath against the foreign policy that brought it all on. And what—they say—of our allies? How can we justify what we are doing to them. What will be the cost to us of the loss of their friendship?

In that reasoning, it would appear to me, is implicit much of the weakness of the American position over the past years. It is a weakness that shows up in the defensive character not only of our deeds, but of our attitudes.

Begin, for instance, with the matter of our allies in western Europe. Why do we think of them as our allies, when it is more accurate to think of ourselves as their allies? A learned strategist recently asked, "What has Israel ever done for us?" Posing just that way, it is hard to come up with the name of a single nation in western Europe that has "done anything for us" in this century. Consider England—long may she wave, and while I am at it I wish Princess Anne great happiness—what has she done for the United States? The question is historically naive. The most obvious favor done in this century by one great country for another is the intercession by the United States in the Second World War, without which intercession Hitler would probably be giving away the bride at Westminster Abbey. Yet that intercession is also explainable in terms of self interest. The prospect of a Hitler-dominated Europe was frightening to us.

But in the current situation, our allies surely need the United States more than the United States needs them? They need our investments, our products, our tourists, our Navy, and above all our nuclear umbrella. West Europe is far gone in the enchantments of what its leaders are pleased to call practical diplomacy. "Even if Russia were presided over by Stalin. I would seek Ostpolitik." Why Brandt is quoted as saying extensively. Defense is pleasing to the Europeans, whose concerns these days are primarily economics and it is not plain how they would inconvenience themselves merely in order to accommodate the United States.

The Arab powers, however, are punishing western Europe for America's role in the

Mideast as principal supplier to Israel, the perennial target of a military machine deployed by the Soviet Union in Arabia. Everyone seeks nowadays to impose pressure through intermediaries. The question arises why the intermediaries do not assert themselves. It mystifies me that western Europe should think of itself as defenseless against the Arab's use of blackmail.

To deprive a country of that which it absolutely needs in order to survive is quite simply an act of war. It is both a moral question and a legal question whether the Arab embargo has reached the point of asphyxiation that warrants belligerent reprisals. But the talk is that it is headed toward that, and the question arises: why should west Europe tolerate it?

The most extreme response to which the Europeans would be driven, is war against the oil producing states. If an abundance of oil can unite Syria and Saudi Arabia, the lack of oil can unite Italy and Scandinavia. A military expedition aimed not at taking over Arab territory, but forcing Arabs to export their oil at the marketplace, would be justified under extreme circumstances, by the laws of nations.

But there are lesser sanctions, and it is not too early to talk about them. I mean a total embargo. No food to Arab ports, no automobiles, no manufactured goods, no tourists, no airplanes. Let the Arabs attempt, for a couple of months, to get from the Soviet Union what it now imports from the United States and Western Europe. The Soviet Union doesn't have enough surplus to export to Greater Moscow, let alone to 100 million Arabs.

There are unpleasant recourses. But why must we be so defensive in our reflexes? The United States is determined to assure the survival of the State of Israel—reduced in size, to be sure from its bloated postwar dimensions. There are strategic and moral reasons for our decision, and no need to swerve from it under the intimidation of a boycott which could be made to hurt the aggressor far more than the intended victims.

E/R PILGRIM AWARD BY AMVETS

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on November 9, 1973, I had the honor of attending the annual Pilgrim Awards Banquet sponsored by the American Veterans of Massachusetts in Randolph, Mass. For 13 years the Department of Massachusetts AMVETS has bestowed these most-coveted Pilgrim awards upon those individuals who are leaders in their professions or chosen endeavors. The awards honor personal sacrifice and initiative, outstanding achievement, and service to country; all very honorable goals which are held in high esteem by this distinguished veteran's organization.

This year I was one of several very fortunate individuals chosen to receive the awards. I was very honored to receive the public service award citing me for service to this great country. Also, this year the Americanism award was presented to Arthur Silvaletta of Dedham, founder of the Wake Up America Committee for Americanism, because he best exemplifies the patriotic spirit which America holds so dear. John L. Quigley, Commandant of the Chelsea Soldiers' Home received the Rehabilitation award for his unselfish and tireless work with

the elderly and disabled American veterans. The Youth Service award recipient was Raymond McConnell of Somerset who has given unstintingly of his time and effort for the benefit of the young people and this Nation's future citizens in the town of Somerset.

William F. Connors of Milton, who is Director of the Veterans' Administration in Boston, was honored with the special commanders award for his service in the VA on behalf of all veterans of our country's wars. The sports award was presented to Eugene Lee, who accepted the award for his son Russell E. Lee.

Russell E. Lee is a young man from Hyde Park who is perhaps one of the finest athletes ever to come from my district. Having known his family for years and having followed his career with some interest, I can personally attest to the high caliber of the individual who was chosen to receive the sports award this year. Russell is currently a respected and well-liked member of the perennially powerful Milwaukee Bucks basketball team. I would also like to share with my colleagues the remarks made about Russell's accomplishments by Past Commander John J. Towey when presenting this truly deserved award.

The remarks follow:

THE AMVETS PILGRIM AWARD FOR SPORTS

The recipient for this year's award is Russell E. Lee. During Russell's school days at Hyde Park High School it was quite evident that he was going to be an outstanding basketball player. He was All Scholastic in football, baseball and track as well as basketball but it was at the latter sport that he really excelled. He was on the Boston Herald-Traveler High School All Star Team in both 1967 and 1968. He was on the Record-American All Scholastic Basketball Team in 1968. In 1968 he was also a member of the All State Basketball Team. During that year he was invited to play in the Capital District Schoolboy Classic at the LaSalette Seminary in upstate New York. The teams were made up of all Star players from many different states in the east. Russell came home with the Most Valuable Player Award that year.

Russell received a scholarship upon graduation from Hyde Park High School to attend Marshall University in West Virginia. His older brother Eugene, also attended Marshall University at that time and they both played on the basketball team in 1968-1969 and 1970-71. It didn't take long for Russell to make a name for himself as he led the Freshman Team to an undefeated season in 1968-69 with 12 victories. The Boston Bomber he was called, as during many games he scored 40 or more points. While at Marshall University he achieved the following honors as he contributed to their championship seasons. He played in the All Steel Bowl in his sophomore year. He was on the All Marshall Invitational Team for three years and was Most Valuable Player in his junior year. During his junior year he was also a District All American on the United States Basketball Writers Association Teams. During both his junior and senior years he was picked by Basketball Extra as one of the nations top 50 college players pre-season. He was named to the All American pre-season team in 1971-72 by Street and Smith Basketball Yearbook. He was also picked for the All Milwaukee Classic during his senior year. It is not surprising to find that he broke every basketball record for Marshall University while a student there.

It is also not surprising that he was a first round draft choice for the Milwaukee Bucks when he graduated from college in 1972. He naturally would have preferred to have been

drafted by the Celtics however he is now playing with Milwaukee and doing very well.

Russell has three brothers who are also outstanding basketball players, Eugene, Jr. is playing semi-pro ball in West Virginia now after a very promising career in professional basketball was interrupted by severe leg injuries sustained in a motorcycle accident. Gerald Lee is playing professional basketball in Helsinki, Finland and younger brother Ronald is an outstanding star basketball player at Oregon University.

This evening Russell's father, Eugene Lee, by the way a very close friend to many of us in the AMVET organization, is going to accept the award for his son. The Milwaukee schedule did not quite fit in with our date for this banquet. They will be in Boston next weekend.

Gene, we are very happy to add the name Russell E. Lee to those who have received the AMVETS, Department of Massachusetts Pilgrim Award for Sports in the past. They were: Eddie Shore, the immortal hockey player, "Red" Auerbach, the Celtics coach, John Kelley, the marathon runner, "Bill" Sullivan, Jr. of the Boston Patriots front office, Arthur DuLong, track star from Randolph, "Nick" Buoniconti, formerly played for the Patriots and now with the Miami Dolphins, the lovable and immortal "Swede" Nelson, "Tony" Conigliaro of Baseball fame, "Joe" Lazzaro, the still world champion blind golfer, "Don" Gillis, the outstanding Boston sports announcer and last year the recipient was the great Boston College football great from years ago "Chuckin" Charlie O'Rourke.

REASON AMIDST FURY

HON. DALE MILFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, in my district last summer a Dallas policeman shot and killed a 12-year-old Mexican youth. Immediately, the officer was charged with murder and has since been found guilty and sentenced to 5 years in prison.

But at the time, the Dallas community was upset. It was an inflammatory situation. National news media focused on the tragedy.

But amidst the storm and fury, a voice of calm and reason spoke out. The voice was an editorial written and delivered by Alex Burton, a newsman for radio KRLD in Dallas.

In keeping with his keen sense of fairness in journalism, Alex mourned the tragedy, commended the overall Dallas police department and called for action to avert future tragedies of this nature.

Honoring this newsman's approach to the situation, Alex Burton's fellow professionals named his editorial as the award-winning editorial and proclaimed it the best radio editorial in Dallas for the year.

Mr. Speaker, I would like for my colleagues in the House to be able to see radio editorial journalism at its finest, therefore, I am inserting it in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

EDITORIAL

Since five o'clock this morning, when I was awakened by a telephone call, I've been involved in the latest Dallas Police shooting. Twelve year old Santos Rodriguez was shot in the head. A police officer, Darryl L. Cain,

has been charged with murder, and suspended indefinitely from the Dallas Police Department. The officer responsible has shown a shocking lack of responsibility and judgment. Chief of Police Dyson has said "There was absolutely no justification for Cain's act." And I'd like to point out the speed with which Cain was suspended and charged with the murder. The Dallas Police Department moves with remarkable swiftness against police who transgress the law. I should also like to point out the statement of Dallas City Councilman Pedro Aguirre who said that everything that can be done legally has been done and he called for calm.

I know that city officials are as anxious for the case to come to court as are the members of the Dallas Mexican-American community and it shall. That is the way it will be done. I do hope that the whole community will adhere to Councilman Aguirre's suggestion for calm. It is easy at this time for feelings to run high, in fact it is to be expected. But the time is more for assurance that such things will not happen again. The search for persons to police this community is a continuing one. Few people want to take on the job. A number of old time policemen have spoken to me today. "I hope" said one, "that this will point out to people how necessary it is not to lower the standards to get more cops."

Another young officer told me of a new system of handling complaints from citizens which will call for psychological tests of officers who are the subject of repeated citizen complaints. What I'm stressing here is the need to see that 12 year old Santos Rodriguez did not die in vain. What I'm stressing here is the need for higher standards for police recruits and continuing betterment of training procedures to weed out the misfits or those who might act irrationally. But mostly what I'm stressing here is the wish that this one tragedy does not spawn others equally as senseless . . .

JAN GRACE—COLORADO'S FIRST WOMAN REALTOR OF THE YEAR

HON. WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Jan Grace of Aurora for her unique achievements in the field of real estate.

Not only was Jan Grace the first woman director of the Aurora Board of Realtors, she was the first woman president.

Not only was she the first woman to be selected by the Aurora Board of Realtors as the Aurora Realtor of the Year, but she was the first woman ever selected by the Colorado Board of Realtors as the Colorado Realtor of the Year.

And as a side note, I would like to point out that Jan Grace was also voted Aurora's Woman of the Year in 1970.

The designation as Realtor of the Year marks a high point in a real estate career which began 10 years ago when Jan and her husband Bill founded Grace Realty. While Bill handles the construction end of the business, now expanded into Grace Enterprises, Jan manages the brokerage and sales of both firms.

She manages them well, and I would like to recommend her actions and accomplishments as an example for all women, and indeed for all Americans.

ANNUAL CONSTITUENT QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1973

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have tallied the results of my annual constituent questionnaire and was quite pleased to note how timely the questions turned out to be. I make special reference to the legislation which the Senate has just passed to provide for Federal financing of political campaigns, and interestingly enough 65 percent of my constituents answered "no" to the question on whether the Federal Government should finance all political campaigns for Federal office.

As might be expected my constituents are very much aware of the energy crisis and some 76 percent would vote to relax environmental regulations if it would help to ease the crisis. On another question of whether there would be resistance to construction of a nuclear powerplant in their area, 74 percent of my constituents answered "no."

For the first time we were able to tabulate these returns into male and female categories, and it was not surprising to find that except in very few instances

husbands and wives were in general agreement on their stands.

We have heard a good deal of hyperbole suggesting that the President was acting as a dictator or a monarch for his vetoes of excessive appropriation bills and also his refusal to spend appropriated funds in some instances. That argument has not registered at all in my congressional district when you consider that 73 percent of the men and 71 percent of the women indicated approval of the President's decision not to spend funds appropriated by Congress where he believes they are excessive; while at the same time 71 percent of the men and 76 percent of the women answered "no" to the question on whether or not the President has abused his veto power.

On other issues defense spending gets a mixed reaction with 41 percent of the men and 43 percent of the women answering affirmatively to the question "Are we spending too much for defense?"

High interest rates have cut back on purchases, the poll reveals, with just about half of my constituents responding to the survey saying that they have decided against buying or building on credit because of interest rates. The percentages were 51 percent for the men and 53 percent for the women.

More men than women approve of expanded trade with the Communist na-

tions of the Soviet Union and Red China, with 61 percent of the men and 51 percent of the women giving approval.

By whopping percentages, my constituents said they want local school officials to determine how Federal aid to education should be spent, with 84 percent of the men and 85 percent of the women voting that way.

The women came out stronger for raising the minimum wage to \$2.20 per hour, with 51 percent voting for, while only 46 percent of the men approving the wage jump.

The death penalty for certain crimes, such as kidnapping, skyjacking, et cetera, got a huge measure of approval, with 87 percent of the men and 81 percent of the women voting for return of capital punishment for specific crimes.

This survey revealed that my constituents are keenly aware of what is going on in Congress and Government, and they have strong and definite opinions about fiscal responsibility, the need to expand our economic boundaries, improve our energy output, be realistic about the environment and pursue a generally prudent course of Government, as they have indicated they are doing personally by curtailing purchases in the face of higher interest rates.

The full results, by counties, of my survey are as follows:

County	Male				Female			
	Total	Yes	No	Undecided	Total	Yes	No	Undecided
Question No. 1: Do you favor elimination of all wage and price controls?								
Bureau	657	337	293	27	589	282	273	34
Brown	72	32	36	4	74	27	39	8
Peoria	3,973	1,708	2,103	162	3,560	1,313	2,025	222
Knox	702	321	348	33	659	256	358	45
Cass	174	90	78	6	154	80	70	4
Mason	279	123	142	14	232	95	122	15
Tazewell	1,538	694	793	51	1,412	537	807	68
Schuyler	85	52	33	0	76	44	32	0
Stark	126	64	54	8	109	50	51	8
Total	7,606	3,421	3,880	305	6,865	2,684	3,777	404
Percent		45.0	51.0	4.0		39.1	55.0	5.9
Question 2: Do you approve of the President's refusal to spend funds appropriated by the Congress where he believes they are excessive?								
Bureau	657	505	128	24	589	446	121	22
Brown	72	56	14	2	74	52	18	4
Peoria	3,973	2,894	947	132	3,560	2,515	876	169
Knox	702	476	195	31	659	428	194	37
Cass	174	119	49	6	154	100	47	7
Mason	279	207	60	12	232	170	48	14
Tazewell	1,538	1,154	339	45	1,412	1,035	327	50
Schuyler	85	65	18	2	76	55	19	2
Stark	126	91	29	6	109	85	23	1
Total	7,606	5,567	1,779	260	6,865	4,886	1,673	306
Percent		73.2	23.4	3.4		71.2	24.4	4.4
Question No. 3: Do you feel we are spending too much for defense?								
Bureau	657	256	370	31	589	239	316	34
Brown	72	25	41	6	74	26	38	10
Peoria	3,973	1,634	2,171	168	3,560	1,583	1,798	179
Knox	702	304	369	29	659	291	326	42
Cass	174	71	100	3	154	65	82	7
Mason	279	107	161	11	232	98	124	10
Tazewell	1,538	618	859	61	1,412	604	726	82
Schuyler	85	33	48	4	76	29	41	6
Stark	126	45	70	11	109	43	62	4
Total	7,606	3,093	4,189	324	6,865	2,978	3,513	374
Percent		40.7	55.1	4.2		43.4	51.2	5.4
Question No. 4: Would you vote to relax some environmental regulations if it helped ease the energy crisis?								
Bureau	657	536	95	26	589	462	101	26
Brown	72	61	9	2	74	63	9	2
Peoria	3,973	2,953	880	140	3,560	2,444	932	184
Knox	702	516	145	41	659	464	156	39
Cass	174	148	23	3	154	122	27	5
Mason	279	216	46	17	232	181	33	18
Tazewell	1,538	1,224	274	40	1,412	1,041	310	61
Schuyler	85	70	13	2	76	59	13	4
Stark	126	100	20	6	109	81	24	4
Total	7,606	5,824	1,505	277	6,865	4,917	1,605	343
Percent		76.6	19.8	3.6		71.6	23.4	5.0

County	Male				Female			
	Total	Yes	No	Undecided	Total	Yes	No	Undecided
Question No. 5: Would you resist construction of a nuclear powerplant in your area?								
Bureau	657	166	456	35	589	232	321	36
Brown	72	25	45	2	74	32	35	7
Peoria	3,973	781	3,011	181	3,560	1,241	2,083	236
Knox	702	156	505	41	659	242	371	46
Cass	174	36	130	8	154	56	92	6
Mason	279	84	178	17	232	93	122	17
Tazewell	1,538	320	1,169	49	1,412	523	820	69
Schuyler	85	31	52	2	76	36	38	2
Stark	126	31	85	10	109	41	62	6
Total	7,606	1,630	5,631	345	6,865	2,496	3,944	425
Percent		21.4	74.0	4.6		36.4	57.4	6.2
Question No. 6: During the past year have you decided against buying or building anything on credit because of interest rates?								
Bureau	657	313	299	45	589	282	251	56
Brown	72	36	32	4	74	38	29	7
Peoria	3,973	2,070	1,671	232	3,560	1,906	1,411	243
Knox	702	363	294	45	659	340	263	56
Cass	174	96	74	4	154	82	66	6
Mason	279	132	130	17	232	115	99	18
Tazewell	1,538	810	678	50	1,412	771	569	72
Schuyler	85	37	44	4	76	40	35	1
Stark	126	55	64	7	109	44	58	7
Total	7,606	3,912	3,286	408	6,865	3,618	2,781	466
Percent		51.4	43.2	5.4		52.7	40.5	6.8
Question No. 7: Do you favor expanded trade with China and Russia?								
Bureau	657	412	211	34	589	316	235	38
Brown	72	38	28	6	74	32	36	6
Peoria	3,973	2,472	1,325	176	3,560	1,863	1,508	189
Knox	702	402	269	31	659	310	311	38
Cass	174	109	53	12	154	83	56	15
Mason	279	184	78	17	232	119	88	25
Tazewell	1,538	905	572	61	1,412	689	641	82
Schuyler	85	41	36	8	76	34	35	7
Stark	126	78	42	6	109	64	43	2
Total	7,606	4,641	2,614	351	6,865	3,510	2,953	402
Percent		61.0	34.4	4.6		51.1	43.0	5.9
Question No. 8: Do you feel State and local school officials are better able to determine how Federal revenues should be spent for education?								
Bureau	657	564	66	27	589	512	50	27
Brown	72	67	4	1	74	68	4	2
Peoria	3,973	3,237	566	170	3,560	2,966	463	131
Knox	702	593	85	24	659	568	64	27
Cass	174	150	15	9	154	136	14	4
Mason	279	236	26	17	232	198	18	16
Tazewell	1,538	1,361	143	34	1,412	1,240	124	48
Schuyler	85	67	14	4	76	62	12	2
Stark	126	107	12	7	109	96	13	0
Total	7,606	6,382	931	293	6,865	5,846	762	257
Percent		83.9	12.2	3.9		85.2	11.1	3.7
Question No. 9: Should Congress raise the minimum wage to \$2.20 an hour?								
Bureau	657	254	372	31	589	244	316	29
Brown	72	24	46	2	74	31	36	7
Peoria	3,973	1,910	1,902	161	3,560	1,878	1,514	168
Knox	702	344	329	29	659	338	289	32
Cass	174	72	95	7	154	65	82	7
Mason	279	116	146	17	232	106	115	11
Tazewell	1,538	734	762	42	1,412	738	609	65
Schuyler	85	30	49	6	76	27	41	8
Stark	126	41	79	6	109	48	56	5
Total	7,606	3,525	3,780	301	6,865	3,475	3,058	332
Percent		46.3	49.7	4.0		50.6	44.5	4.9
Question No. 10: Do you favor the death penalty for certain crimes such as kidnapping, sky-jacking, etc.?								
Bureau	657	571	57	29	589	476	82	31
Brown	72	64	7	1	74	55	11	8
Peoria	3,973	3,416	414	143	3,560	2,849	573	138
Knox	702	599	76	27	659	534	105	20
Cass	174	154	17	3	154	129	23	2
Mason	279	250	16	13	232	201	20	11
Tazewell	1,538	1,338	162	38	1,412	1,151	207	54
Schuyler	85	78	5	2	76	63	10	3
Stark	126	108	9	9	109	87	18	4
Total	7,606	6,578	763	265	6,865	5,545	1,049	271
Percent		86.5	10.0	3.5		80.8	15.3	3.9
Question No. 11: Do you feel the President has abused his veto power?								
Bureau	657	149	461	47	589	144	404	41
Brown	72	24	45	3	74	23	44	7
Peoria	3,973	962	2,809	202	3,560	953	2,378	229
Knox	702	209	450	43	659	193	420	46
Cass	174	51	112	11	154	52	91	11
Mason	279	72	191	16	232	59	156	17
Tazewell	1,538	337	1,149	52	1,412	335	993	84
Schuyler	85	27	52	6	76	22	44	10
Stark	126	22	93	11	109	19	82	8
Total	7,606	1,853	5,362	391	6,865	1,800	4,612	453
Percent		24.4	70.5	5.1		26.2	67.2	6.6

County	Male				Female			
	Total	Yes	No	Undecided	Total	Yes	No	Undecided
Question No. 12: Do you believe the Federal Government should finance all political campaigns for Federal office?								
Bureau	657	173	441	43	589	157	390	42
Brown	72	13	54	5	74	16	52	6
Peoria	3,973	1,291	2,504	178	3,560	1,149	2,245	166
Knox	702	227	443	32	659	202	423	34
Cass	174	52	112	10	154	46	99	9
Mason	279	77	190	12	232	70	150	12
Taxewell	1,538	498	1,002	38	1,412	413	937	62
Schuyler	85	20	63	2	76	15	57	4
Stark	126	31	83	12	109	27	78	4
Total	7,606	2,382	4,892	332	6,865	2,095	4,431	339
Percent		31.3	64.3	4.4		30.5	64.5	5.0

NATIONWIDE CAMPAIGN TO CONSERVE FUEL

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I well realize the depth of the current energy crisis and the importance of a concerted nationwide campaign to conserve fuel. I have warned of this possibility for the past 7 years and sponsored several measures designed to stimulate our domestic energy production.

But the point I want to make here, Mr. Speaker, is that we must approach the problem of energy conservation with wisdom. As we enact legislation and oversee executive regulations, we must realize that while sacrifices must be made, and fuel consumption must be reduced, that we should also avoid unnecessary and disastrous economic impact. As we move to solve one problem, we do not want to create more severe ones.

This week, I heard from a constituent in my home district who pointed out that the reduction of the highway speed to 50 mph would conserve \$1,319 worth of gasoline a month by his company trucks, but that this would cost his company \$8,424 a month in increased labor costs. We are all going to be hearing similar stories about economic impact of energy conservation measures.

In most cases, the conservation measures are going to have to be taken, but, Mr. Speaker, we shall be foolish indeed, if we use pure zeal, untempered with wisdom, in dealing with the energy crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I include material provided to me by Mr. Ed Weber, vice president for public affairs for Southwest Public Service Co., an electric company based in Amarillo, Tex., at this point in the RECORD:

MATERIAL BY ED WEBER

The allocations process should not penalize utilities which, through sound planning, have acquired the fuel resources necessary to serve their customers.

The people, who have resisted development of the Atlantic Shelf and other off-shore resources, must be made to realize they can't have the convenience of modern living without the necessities which provide them.

Sooner or later, some consideration is going to have to be given to the economic im-

part of the hysteria approach now being used. Turning off the lights, or turning down the thermostats, in the 13th Texas Congressional District, isn't going to make one more drop of fuel oil available to Senator Kennedy's cold Massachusetts constituents. It is going to create unnecessary economic depression in the 13th Texas District and will add to the difficulties of future financing for the electric utility serving that district. It's just basically wrong to penalize the people who saw the problem and worked to solve it, and that's what is being done right now.

The impact of daylight saving time in the extreme western end of the Central Time Zone should be considered. In January, if we are in daylight saving time, the sun will rise after 9:00 in the morning. This will create a real safety problem for young school children.

Cutting the speed limit to 50 miles per hour will add \$8,424 a month to our labor costs to save \$1,319 worth of gasoline. That's at present gas prices. That makes the net annual cost of the reduced speed to our company alone \$85,260.

We could probably make the fuel saving without the additional labor cost by removing the emission-control devices from the vehicles. They are obviously needed in large metropolitan areas, but not out here.

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend a belated birthday greeting to the U.S. Army War College, which is located in the Carlisle Barracks at Carlisle, Pa., my congressional district.

On November 27, this war college was 72 years old. Having been originally located in Washington, D.C., it was moved to its present location in 1951.

This is indeed a unique institution. It was founded by Elihu Root, the famous American statesman and lawyer. The college came into being as an advanced course of professional study for Army officers. General orders published on November 27, 1901, directed that it be known as the Army War College. In effect, the college performs as a postgraduate course for the study of comprehensive problems of military science and the national defense. One of the most prominent grad-

uates of the Army War College was a famous constituent of mine, the late Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The term "Army War College" is really a misnomer, in a sense, for the object of the college is "not to promote war but to preserve peace." This slogan is inscribed at the main entrance to the Carlisle Barracks.

I would like to then, at this time, wish a belated happy birthday to this institution which, in being conceived to comprehend war, hopes that through this comprehension it can obtain peace.

EXCELLENT COUNSEL ON THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to read over an address delivered by our colleague, Congressman H. JOHN HEINZ III, on November 19 to the North Hills Chamber of Commerce, Pittsburgh, Pa. JOHN and I serve together on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which, as you know, currently is marking up the National Energy Emergency Act—vital emergency fuel shortages legislation.

In his special address just a few days ago, Congressman HEINZ focused on many of the issues involved in our energy crisis. And, of equal importance, he spoke of concrete action that can be taken not only on the governmental level, but by individual citizens as well. It is sound and reasonable counsel. I strongly recommend a reading of this speech for excellent background information as this Congress moves ahead on energy legislation. Congressman HEINZ's address follows:

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III—ADDRESS ON THE ENERGY CRISIS TO NORTH HILLS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, PITTSBURGH, PA., NOVEMBER 19, 1973

Just twelve days ago President Nixon addressed the nation on the energy crisis.

Four days later—on last Monday—House and Senate committees began taking action on sweeping new legislation.

Just last Friday in Philadelphia, White House aide, Peter Flannigan, addressed the

challenge of "Operation Independence" to consumers, businessmen and government officials in the Middle Atlantic Federal Region (which includes Pennsylvania).

And today here in Pittsburgh, as we discuss energy problems and their consequences for each of us, the Environmental Protection Agency is releasing the transportation control strategy for Allegheny County.

When this week's too lengthy and ill-timed congressional recess concludes next Monday, my Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will begin marking up the National Energy Emergency Act of 1973 and making our final decisions about the bill's provisions. This far-reaching measure requires, among other things, (1) mandatory federal action to conserve fuel through conversion to coal by oil and gas burning plants, (2) regulatory changes to increase available domestic petroleum supplies (3) the development and implementation of economic incentives by the Cost of Living Council and other agencies to promote energy conservation, (4) reduce fuel use by industries supervised by regulatory agencies like the CAB and ICC, through cutbacks in air schedules, for example, (5) subsidies to mass transit to increase utilization, and (6) the additional development of fuel shortages contingency plans, including the authority for the President to impose gasoline rationing.

In addition, my Committee has already taken action on year round Daylight Savings Time, both the House and Senate have sent to the President a comprehensive oil and petroleum fuels allocation bill, and the Alaskan pipeline bill has just been signed into law.

As this sudden activity might suggest, the energy shortage we face today is indeed critical. It was not entirely unforeseen. But the immediacy of the problem, of course, is that Arab oil production cutbacks and embargoes—even though we directly import relatively small amounts of petroleum from Arab Nations—have affected the majority of our import supplies, imports which total three out of every ten barrels of oil we need. In Canada, for example, Arab action has effectively cut off the oil supplies to all of Canada east of the Ottawa River, the area where most Canadians reside. The Canadians have had little choice but to take precipitative steps to protect their nation by starting to divert substantial quantities of oil that would otherwise have been imported into the United States.

Over the last decade our demand for petroleum has grown to the staggering sum of 17 million barrels a day—just about half of our total national energy needs.

Of every 10 barrels of petroleum, approximately half, or five barrels in ten, is used for transportation purposes. Nearly four of these five barrels are consumed by highway vehicles, a dependence that continues to grow as Americans set purchase records of cleaner, heavier and air-conditioned automobiles.

Homeowners, industry, large buildings and electric utilities use the other half of our petroleum requirements. Here, too, reliance has continued to grow as shortages and higher prices of natural gas or low-sulfur coal, accelerated by air pollution laws, has forced this sector to substitute residual fuel oil and distillate fuels, both of which are derived from crude oil. Demand for synthetic materials of all kinds has also been a significant factor.

Even without the Middle East crisis, we would have experienced a shortage of at least a half million barrels per day due to burgeoning demand in the United States. But, with the uncertainties in Arab oil producing countries, it is currently estimated we face a shortage of two to three million barrels a day, or between 12 percent and 18 percent of our daily requirement. We do not know how long the acute shortage brought

about by the Arabs will last. We do not know that the shortage won't become worse since our total oil imports are five million barrels a day, and we have seen how a world shortage is beginning to affect our largest source of imported crude, namely Canada. Furthermore, a colder than usual winter in either Europe or North America—or worse, both—would dramatically aggravate the situation.

We can predict a very difficult winter regardless of even the best turn of events, even in the Middle East. This is because once crude oil supplies are interrupted, as they have been for some weeks now, worldwide refining capacity is so limited that the difference cannot be made up for many months. Right now we are living off the "pipeline," mainly inventories and tanker stocks in transit.

Testimony before my Committee last week indicated that even if Arabs started putting the maximum amount of oil back into the pipeline as of last Tuesday, we would nonetheless be obliged to involuntarily conserve over 50 million barrels in the months immediately ahead—a figure equivalent to a five percent shortage through the middle of January.

Our nation finally has come face-to-face with the energy crisis—a crisis which I believe will bring about profound changes in the American way of life.

Beyond the fact that in the icy months of the coming winter we may all be a little cold and inconvenienced by gasoline shortages, the fuel crisis has larger implications. I mean the near certainty of increased inflation and the possibility of unemployment—perhaps a recession by next spring, the likelihood of sluggish economic growth over the next decade, and concurrent reduced military flexibility by U.S. forces around the world.

Some have warned for many years that America's insatiable energy appetite was on a collision course with massive fuel shortages, but until last summer's gasoline shortage these warnings were either ignored or dismissed as alarmist cries. Perhaps the brighter side of the Arab oil embargo is that it has driven a message home abruptly and has made us face unpleasant facts sooner than we would have otherwise. The dawning reality is that we cannot neither continue to satisfy our appetite for energy consumption nor continue our dependence upon foreign suppliers for one-third of our oil.

Let me say frankly that in these remarks I am not pretending to be an expert, I'm not. And I am sure we will not be able to confront but a few of the issues you and others have on your mind.

How we got into our predicament is not as important as how we get out of it. If government is to blame, I am sure there is more than enough to go around between federal departments, the independent regulatory agencies, the Congress and the "energy industry." It is what we learn from past trends or inadequacies that is important. Right now there isn't time for the White House or my colleagues to be second guessing each other when we should be applying ourselves to the problem.

While the Clean Air Act, for example, has increased energy consumption up to now, I believe the measures to control automobile pollution will result in considerable fuel savings in the next two years.

At the present time we are paying a considerable fuel penalty for auto emission controls averaging at least ten percent and going as high as 30 percent or more in the case of the bigger and heavier models. By no means is all this penalty attributable to those complicated devices that make my 1973 Buick sputter when I accelerate to pass. At least half the penalty is caused by the extra weight from bumpers and impact protection and more electronic gadgetry, especially air conditioning.

Fortunately, the adoption of the catalytic converter by 1976, as required, will just about eliminate the fuel penalty caused by the 1973 car pollution controls. Moreover, based on recent statistics, I expect that the fuel consumed by automobiles will be further minimized as more Americans turn to lighter, smaller models in response to increased world prices for petroleum. Finally, the transportation control strategies required by the Clean Air Act—although extremely controversial in some areas—will have the effect of reducing vehicle miles travelled.

On Wednesday, November 7, President Nixon addressed the nation on the question of the energy crisis and outlined a far-reaching energy program with the goal of self-sufficiency by 1980.

I believe Congress and the Administration should and must cooperate in designing and making a reality, a research and implementation program of both energy conservation and resource development to achieve energy self-sufficiency as quickly as possible in the years ahead.

Right now we import close to one-third of all our oil and absent a major effort to change, we will become 50 percent dependent on imports by 1980. The balance of payments drain this represents is positively staggering. At an average price of \$5 a barrel—far lower than the world market price today—this represents a \$9 billion a year expenditure. By 1980, we could be talking about \$10 per barrel and eight million barrels a day, or \$30 billion a year outlay to foreign oil producers. As rich as we are, this is an expenditure that we quite literally cannot afford. An avoidance of such a disastrous drain on our national resources must be a matter of the highest priority.

While we should and must make every effort, I am personally pessimistic that we can reach the goal by 1980. We are talking about something infinitely more complex than the famous Manhattan project. For one thing, energy conservation will require changes in traditional industrial and building practices, new habits to grow accustomed to and even a changed lifestyle for the entire American people. For another, development will require a delicate balance between environmental considerations in strip mining, water pollution and the health effects of the air we breathe. The Manhattan project, in comparison, had only to take advantage of several physical laws while maximizing the adverse side effects!

It is reassuring to hear the President say that we can attain self-sufficiency by 1980 by spending ten billion dollars.

It sounds very precise and thoughtful to break down the expenditures into categories such as:

\$1 billion for fuel extraction (oil and gas stimulation, oil shale development, waste conversion and under coal mining)

\$1 billion for nuclear fusion (research and technological development)

\$1 billion for advanced power cycles (such as fuel cells and the open cycle MHD that is being researched right here in Southwestern Pennsylvania)

\$4 billion for fuels from coal (better coal utilization, concluding advanced combustion, low BTU gasification, liquefaction and stack gas cleaning)

\$1½ billion each on solar energy, geothermal energy electrical transmission and urban and residential technologies.

It is easy to say that the problem is well in hand and spending money will solve it by 1980.

Let me assure you to the contrary.

The program for energy self-sufficiency announced by the President on November 7 may be nothing more than wishful thinking.

It is true that we must do something about our tremendous dependency on imported oil.

And, in many instances the direction of the program areas is correct, but there is

unfortunately—and embarrassingly—little support or rationale for the amounts set forth, or for the how of employing this investment.

The truth is that no master plan as yet exists. This became abundantly clear last Tuesday to my Committee when Governor Love, an able man handicapped by a total staff of only 11 professionals, admitted that the Administration could not provide to our Committee any details of the plan or any draft legislation for the "so-called" self-sufficiency program.

In pointing this out it is my intention not to be critical but to factually confront the cold reality of the challenge and programs we face.

On a superficial level, I think the amounts of investment projected which works out to less than \$1.5 billion per year—could be inadequate and low. In comparison we have been spending close to \$2 billion year after year on the space program since the early 1960's. Twelve, fifteen or twenty billion dollars might be closer to the truth, as well as 10 or 15 years rather than seven.

But consider some of the more perplexing questions.

Should the President's investment proposal, which averages out to \$1.4 billion per year be all federal; i.e., taxpayers—money?

Today in this nation, energy production and distribution alone is a \$100 billion a year industry. By 1980, due in part to price increases to near world levels, it will be a \$200 billion a year business. Shouldn't such massive industry which accounts for nearly 10 percent of our total gross national product, and whose profitability has never been better—shouldn't such an industry undertake a considerable proportion—if not all—of this much needed investment? How can we justify spending vast quantities of taxpayers money in an industry which has never had better times and whose future outlook and profit security is unsurpassed? Alternatively, if some or any of this investment is made by the public, which *quid pro quo* should be extracted to benefit the public?

We might also ask who is going to do all this research. Is it our universities or government scientists or the reluctant energy companies or is it going to be new, bold entrepreneurs and businesses who will specialize their talents to achieve tremendous progress? As in the race to the moon, are we going to waste billions in our haste? And we might consider whether ten years from now, we will be saddled with another shrunken or bankrupt industry and more Ph.D.'s driving taxi-cabs, as has been the case with aerospace.

And of particular importance, shouldn't we wonder how are we as a nation going to integrate this program of investment with the new laws that Congress and the Administration must cooperate to make? I mean new laws on stripmining, offshore drilling, natural gas pricing, power plant citing, deep-water ports, nondegradation and other questions where little leadership has been taken in recent years. Will the Congress overcome its habit of reacting only on a crisis-to-crisis basis and become a body of far-sighted statesmen? Will the President and legislative leaders of both parties sit down together and hammer out solutions instead of pointing fingers at each other?

Irrespective of managing all our future problems, there are things we can and should be doing right now in Washington to avoid the very serious problems we face this winter.

First, I believe Congress should enact the Emergency Energy Act, including provisions to grant temporary variances from the Clean Air Act for stationary sources while at the same time requiring the use of proven anti-pollution technology. As I mentioned earlier, the act contains additional provision for conversion, conservation, increased production

and the development of mandatory state and local contingency plans.

Second, I am convinced the President should be given standby authority to impose gasoline and other fuel rationing and be ready to use it soon. There should be no increased federal gasoline taxes. Even with existing price controls, the cost of gasoline will rise steeply and quickly. Moreover, a gas tax would be regressive. And finally, since a one-cent increase means one billion dollars in revenue, a big gasoline tax would take money out of the economy at a time when we could be headed for a recession. I am unalterably opposed to such a tax.

As to fuel rationing, I think it will have to be imposed if the Arabs continue the oil export embargo beyond December 1. Because of the political situation in Israel as the Israelis approach their December 31 elections, it seems highly unlikely that a sufficient Israeli-Arab settlement will be reached until well after the first of the new year. This situation will place us in a disastrous fuel shortage condition with no alternative but to take drastic steps to protect ourselves.

Consequently, I think the President should and—despite his statement to the contrary—will decide to implement gasoline rationing immediately as practical falling a resolution of the Arab-Israeli differences in the next two weeks.

Third, we should consider the enactment of an excess profits tax on the energy industry to prevent profiteering and the reaping of a windfall at the expense of a helpless American public.

Failure by the oil, gas and coal industries to restrain the profit maximizing principle and failure to substantially increase investment in developing clean and environmentally acceptable fuels from resources like coal and oil shale could result in comprehensive government regulation of the entire energy industry, including, for example, regulating the rate of return of heretofore unregulated producing companies like Gulf Oil and Consolidation Coal.

Fourth, we should examine incentives to economize energy consumption of all kinds, including disincentives such as control fees. But, to the extent that any control fees on energy are put into effect, such as the gasoline tax increase which I oppose, any revenues from such control fees must be redistributed on a dollar-for-dollar basis among the American public and the hardpressed individual American taxpayer. As a practical matter, this could be accomplished through tax credits or prompt cash distribution.

Fifth, we should take immediate steps to conserve and limit the exportation of already manufactured or used materials. The refining and manufacture of aluminum, steel, copper and other metals, ores and raw materials requires huge amounts of energy. Yet, we are actually exporting unlimited quantities of these refined products abroad without account of the dangerous consequences. Scrap steel has been one particularly crucial area of concern to me for over a year now. At a time when our balance of trade has risen dramatically in the surplus, we cannot justify the export of scrap steel at the rate of one million tons per month. I believe we should at once establish a quota or export-embargo system to protect these vital and increasingly scarce resources.

Sixth, we must make sure that the energy resources that we have, together with the resulting shortages, are allocated fairly among geographic areas of our country with priority given to protecting jobs and heating homes.

I read in last Monday's *Wall Street Journal* that a spokesman for the building owners had said that we won't have a "Light Up Night" in Pittsburgh this year because, although there is no prospect of a major power shortage in this area, it seemed unfair to those who might be facing shortages. I applauded the action, but the explanation while

well-meaning, shows how naive we can be. The fact is that the electricity or energy we save today can be saved and used by someone else, somewhere else tomorrow—or several months from now. One railroad car of coal that need not be burned here is one railroad car more to deliver to the hard-pressed East Coast.

With this in mind, I am taking this occasion to call upon state and local government, and most of all, you our fellow citizens to take steps, starting today, to conserve gasoline, oil, electricity, heat—energy in all its forms.

This is not a matter of altruism. Economic dislocation because of a fuel shortage in another state or city will be irresistibly felt here in Pittsburgh. We will correspondingly sell less, transport less, manufacture less, work less and spend less because we will have less.

I believe that the Governor of Pennsylvania should immediately develop and implement an energy crisis program that details specific actions to be taken by state departments and agencies, and that lists legislative actions required, if any, by the General Assembly and Senate. The list of possible actions is considerable. In my opinion, serious consideration should be given to it immediately.

Reducing state speed limits to a maximum of 50 mph, with possible exceptions for trucks and buses.

A program to require better engine tuneups for all automotive vehicles, and particular attention to stricter enforcement of existing requirements.

Directing state regulatory commissions for electricity and natural gas to "reverse" the present rate schedules to give incentives to economize rather than give cheaper rates as use increases as is now the case, and

Regulatory commission action to insure maximum conversion to coal and attention to generating only those amounts of electricity that are needed.

Directing local government throughout Pennsylvania to prepare contingency plans that, if put into effect, can save up to 25 percent of normal energy requirements.

I believe Allegheny County and the Pittsburgh City government can, in cooperation with business and the public, start immediately to set an example for the rest of the state and indeed, the nation, by voluntarily implementing within ten days a plan to curtail energy consumption by 15 percent.

The first step is to appoint someone who will be responsible for the job.

The second step is to agree on the means of reaching this ambitious but, I believe, prudent goal.

For business, stores and government, I suggest consideration of the staggering working hours, setting thermostats to 68 degrees, strong incentives for car pooling, the adjustment of shopping hours, and curtailments of nighttime lighting.

And for each of us as individual citizens, I urge you to give up a few of the conveniences we have learned to live with especially those that save gasoline and electricity.

What conveniences?

Leave ten minutes earlier for work and give yourself time to drive no faster than 50 miles per hour. When I was driving in from the airport today on the Parkway West, 42 autos and trucks passed me. I passed one cement mixer but he had just turned on at the Carnegie ramp and was going up Greentree Hill. As I hit the Fort Pitt Tunnel, I think I could see him gaining on me! Hopefully, I won't feel so out of place and vulnerable next time.

Surprise your wife and wash the dishes. And instead of putting them in the dishwasher, wash them in the sink with elbow power and not loads of hot water. Even though your enthusiasm may have to be

curbed, the same idea can be applied to self-cleaning ovens.

Make the first of the month bills something more pleasant to look forward to by not buying any unnecessary electric appliances. If buy you must, compare wattage requirements.

Check the weatherstripping and insulation around doors and windows and use storm windows if you can. They keep out the noise of low-flying aircraft, kids and other forms of pollution.

Try to encourage more efficient use of the family automobile by combining all doctor, shopping, and picking up the kids into one sweep. Get the neighbors to join in, too.

Take at least three friends to work if you drive your own car. If you don't have three friends, maybe you need Dale Carnegie.

Take a shower rather than a bath. Even if you only take a bath once a week, this means you.

Stay home more and avoid unnecessary pleasure and business trips. The place you are going may be blacked out anyway or the aircraft may not have enough fuel to make it. Besides, spouses and kids like the companionship.

Don't keep your family in the dark, but do turn off all unnecessary lights. You might even try substituting 60 watt bulbs for 100 watts, or unscrewing the second bulb in the living room lamp. You might find this kind of environment temptingly romantic, so use good judgment at all times.

I suspect I sound like Ann Landers with all this advice, but like Ann Landers, I am trying to get all of you . . . people . . . to adjust lifestyles to reality and to analyze how to live more conservatively, less wastefully, and perhaps with more satisfaction.

Quite seriously, I hope you will all consider your own habits in moving around, in buying, in wasting the precious resources all of us depend on. You, as business leaders, can set an example in your companies, your communities and your homes. You can encourage public awareness of the problems and push for solutions as I have tried to do today with you. The problems are complex but the issues are inescapable. Since I understand that the program—under the "fairness doctrine" provides for interrogation of the speaker, if you have any questions, I will do my best to answer them.

But at this time, let me particularly emphasize my sincere appreciation of this opportunity to discuss our national and local energy issues with you.

I thank you very much.

WASHINGTON STAGE COMPANY INVITED TO SOVIET UNION

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, this past summer, Washington-area theater-goers found justifiable pride in the announcement that the Arena Stage Co. of the District of Columbia had been invited to visit the Soviet Union and perform two plays on a cultural exchange basis between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

The Arena players were well received in Moscow and returned to the United States with glowing accounts of their visit. Soviet propagandists also made much of the Arena company and its productions.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, the Kremlin now takes a dim view of the entire episode because this fine group of American

actors and actresses has joined the spreading chorus of those appealing for the civil rights of artists and intellectuals in Soviet Russia.

The object of the Arena company's concern at the moment is the case of Valery and Galina Panov, dismissed from the Kirov Ballet in Leningrad and publicly denounced simply because they had asked for the right to emigrate from the Soviet tyranny.

Sixty members of the Arena Stage Co. troupe signed an appeal distributed before Thanksgiving in front of the Soviet Embassy in Washington by members of the Arena company.

I cite this matter for two reasons: First it demonstrates once again that American citizens born to freedom are not about to turn their backs on their counterparts living under Communist oppression no matter how much smiling, lip service is paid by their hosts to so-called détente with the United States, and second, it shows that, despite recent news accounts to the contrary, the Soviet Union has not moderated in its cruel persecution of those among its citizenry who try to leave the country or are, in any way imaginable, critical of the Communist regime.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the plea of the members of the Arena Stage Co. of Washington to the Soviet authorities be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with the names of the thespians who signed it. Thank you.

The material follows:

A PLEA TO THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT BY MEMBERS OF THE ARENA STAGE COMPANY ON BEHALF OF VALERY AND GALINA PANOV

Valery and Galina Panov are suffering cruelly from official reprisals following their application for exist visas. They have been demoted and dismissed from the Kirov Ballet in Leningrad, and have been denied access to the stage for practice—a desperate condition for artists at the peak of their professional life who must train daily to stay in shape. They are the apparent victims of a concerted official effort to destroy them as performing artists.

On November 1, 1973, the Panovs announced they were beginning a hunger strike. The failing health of Galina Panov has prevented her continuation; Valery Panov continues his physical protest of their barbarous treatment.

As artists we share the Panovs' convictions—they have an inherent human right to peaceful emigration, a condition of freedom essential to the development of every artist, every human being. As members of an acting company recently returned from the Soviet Union, we are still aglow with the warm generosity of the Russian people, the manifest greatness of the Russian soul. We know first-hand that the persecution of Valery and Galina Panov is utterly foreign to the spirit of the Russian people and their great artists, living and dead, whose profound testaments to the indomitability of the human spirit must provide great encouragement to the two dancers now languishing in Leningrad.

We join our fellow actors across the world in their outrage at the deplorable condition of these two long-suffering artists. We demand, in the name of humanity and in the spirit of true cultural exchange, that Valery and Galina Panov be immediately granted permission to emigrate as they desire.

Robert Alexander, Howard L. Anderson, Stanley Anderson, Jr., Richard Bauer, Gary Bayer, William R. Burdette, Leslie Cass, Cheryl G. Clark, William G. Clark, Esther

Coles, Thrynn Kirby Crowell, Terrence Currier, Elizabeth Darr, Richard R. Dietrich, Richard Dix, Augustine Dunn, Dana Elcar, Christine Estes, Thomas C. Fichandler, Zeida Fichandler.

Lucy Flanagan, Fran Gallogly, Richard Gasparotti, Norman Gevanthor, Henry R. Gorfeln, Jan Greenfield, Jane Groves, Mark Hammer, Dorothea Hammond, Suzanne Heard, Allen Hughes, Tom Klunis, Hugo Koch, Margaret Laves, Hugh Lester, Glenn Lloyd, John Marriott, Macon McCalman, Sidney McLain, Ronald McLarty.

Alton Miller, Judith Ogus, Irvin K. Okin, JoAnn M. Overholt, Nora Pepper, Robert Prosky, David Reinhardtsen, Richard Schaefer, Alan Schneider, Simon Slegl, Stuart Silver, Lee Smith, Miriam Smith, Vance Sorrells, Dianne Wiest, Sharon Williams, Howard Witt, Max Wright, Wendell Wright, Cathy Young.

MONTANA HOSPITAL COSTS

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, I think it is interesting to note and would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the low costs that have been maintained by Montana hospitals in comparison with the United States and the Mountain region. Hospital care is a major concern to all of us, and we are all striving to enable each individual to receive adequate care at the lowest possible cost. I think the Montana hospitals should be commended for their efforts toward controlling increases in costs. Below is a table which lists the comparisons from 1967 through 1972:

HOSPITAL COSTS			
	Cost per patient day	Average daily stay	Total cost per patient stay
1967:			
United States.....	\$54.99	8.2	\$450.92
Mountain region.....	53.77	7.1	378.93
Montana.....	44.73	7.1	317.58
1968:			
United States.....	62.18	8.3	516.09
Mountain region.....	60.51	7.3	441.72
Montana.....	48.69	7.3	355.44
1969:			
United States.....	71.07	8.2	582.77
Mountain region.....	66.57	7.2	479.30
Montana.....	52.57	7.4	389.02
1970:			
United States.....	81.80	8.2	670.76
Mountain region.....	77.38	7.1	549.40
Montana.....	60.57	7.1	431.05
1971:			
United States.....	93.84	8.1	760.10
Mountain region.....	88.81	6.8	603.91
Montana.....	67.73	6.7	453.79
1972:			
United States.....	105.13	8.0	841.40
Mountain region.....	102.03	6.6	673.90
Montana.....	77.92	6.7	522.40

PARK RIDGE, ILL.: A CENTURY OF PRIDE

HON. SAMUEL H. YOUNG

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a centennial celebration taking place in Park Ridge, Ill. It has been said that the family is the corner-

stone of the community, and the community is the cornerstone of the Nation. With cornerstones like Park Ridge, the United States has an unparalleled foundation in the history of the world. I would like to insert in the RECORD the following remarks about Park Ridge:

PARK RIDGE, ILL.: A CENTURY OF PRIDE

This year, 1973, the city of Park Ridge celebrates its centennial. One hundred years have passed since Park Ridge was incorporated under the law of Illinois.

The growth of Park Ridge is typical of many communities across the U.S. In the early 1800s peaceful Indians and farmers occupied the area. Fertile land, forests, and waterways such as the Des Plaines River offered ideal conditions for farming. More people came to this wilderness and settled. The Maine Township political government was officially organized in 1850.

The population began to increase after George W. Penny opened a brickyard in 1854. He was able to make bricks of excellent quality from a wealth of rich clay in the area and his business boomed. For the next five years the community was known as Pennyville. Penny's brickyard flourished when the railroad came through several years later. He was able to load his bricks on box cars and ship them to Chicago.

Pennyville was a community in which the people worked together and helped one another. When a structure was needed on property to cross the Des Plaines River, neighbors helped Mancel Talcott to construct a bridge, which lasted until an 1890 flood. Talcott was the first postmaster in the vicinity, and Talcott Road is named in his honor.

Education was, from the beginning of the community, important to the early settlers. The tiny school-house built by the pioneers grew into District 64, which today consists of nine public elementary schools, two junior high schools, and two public high schools.

The area was changing from an agricultural community to an affluent business town. Because of the brick industry the community continued to expand. At George Penny's request the name of Brickton was adopted. Penny's bricks were used for homes and churches throughout the area. The clay supply grew less and less until finally, in 1872, bricks were no longer manufactured. The people of Brickton wondered whether the town would survive without the brick industry.

It was the Great Chicago Fire of 1871 which turned the tide of events. Although much of Chicago was destroyed, the fire drove stricken city-dwellers out to the suburbs for a fresh start. Once again, Brickton began to grow. Incorporated as a village in 1873, the name of Park Ridge was selected on the Fourth of July. The name was an appropriate choice because of the high appearance of the town. George B. Carpenter was elected the first president of Park Ridge. In 1910, it was voted to change from village government to the city form of government. Dr. A. J. Buchheit, who still resides in Park Ridge, was elected its first mayor.

The centennial festival was held June 29 through July 4. This six-day "Birthday Party" was held at West Park, the Centennial Festival Fairgrounds. Festivities included performances by the Maine Township High School South Concert Band and Cavalier Drum and Bugle Corps. Featured also were rock band contests, a variety show, games and carnival rides for the children, and speeches by Mayor Martin Butler and other prominent citizens. The turn-out was tremendous. The plans and efforts put forth by the Centennial Committee were well-received and appreciated. Other events of the centennial celebration include the Centennial Ball, ceremonies on Armistice Day, and the Christmas Parade.

I would like to congratulate Mayor Martin Butler, the Park Ridge Historical Society the Park Ridge Chamber of Commerce, and the citizens of Park Ridge for all of their efforts in making the year a memorable one. A great deal of community spirit and involvement went into making the centennial a success.

The officers of the Park Ridge Historical Society deserve special mention for their efforts: Peter Malone, Chairman; Paul Carlson, President; Harry Madsen, Treasurer; Eleanor Schiessle, Secretary; as well as the Board members: Mrs. Roberta Mellon, Mrs. Gladys Ahrensfield, Mrs. Dorothy Hansen, Norman Brown, Mrs. Jan Juckett, Dr. Frank Yonan, Mrs. Denis Pomeroy, David Barnes, Robert Schwarz, James Schaefer, Irving Gillick, Herbert Anderson and Alden Wilson.

Park Ridge has indeed been a century of pride. It's a great city, and I'm privileged to represent its citizens.

H.R. 10710

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, the trade bill, H.R. 10710, has been poised for House floor action now for almost 2 months. This bill had been tentatively scheduled for floor action in October and in November, but was removed from those schedules.

The delay has been at the administration's request. It is over an issue which is important, but is really peripheral to the central purpose of the bill. The bill's central purpose is to authorize U.S. participation in negotiations leading to reform of the international trading system. The stumbling block from the administration's viewpoint is a proposed amendment to prohibit credits to the Soviet Union as long as that country does not freely allow the emigration of its citizens.

The impasse is caused, on the one hand, by the strength of feeling in both Houses of Congress over humanitarian considerations, and on the other, by the deep concern felt by the administration over the effect that adoption of the prohibition on credits would have on our relations with the Soviet Union, and the chance of peace in the Middle East.

Passage by the House of the bill is the essential first hurdle for the bill, without which there will be no legislation on this matter. While it is probably true that if the bill goes to the floor in the next few weeks, the provisions relating to emigration from Communist countries will be adopted by the floor, it should be recognized by persons on both sides of that issue that the bill must be considered by the Senate, that there will be time there to reflect and debate on some of the issues involved. Perhaps there are some compromise provisions that would adequately protect the interests of both sides which can be worked out.

In the meantime progress on the trade bill is important to the trading system and the chances for its successful reform. The United States does not dominate the international economic system as it did in the two decades following the

Second World War. If we do not legislate here to shape the direction that the evolution of the system will take, others will do so and we will not like the results.

We complain about the preferential trading arrangements that the Europeans make with the bulk of the rest of the world. We are not happy with the closed nature of the Japanese economy. We want adequate internationally agreed safeguards to protect against injury from imports. We want to avoid the past burdens of the United States carrying agricultural stocks for the world, to feel the full effects of high agricultural demand in lean years, and to have to let our land lie fallow in the better years so that inefficient foreign farming can be maintained. We want to have fair international rules governing trade, and fair procedures to settle international trade disputes.

These problems do not lie dormant while we review the foreign policy aspects of the Jackson-Vanik amendment. Rather, these problems become more serious.

I do not pretend to be as informed as Secretary Kissinger is on the state of our relations with the Soviets. But I do understand the importance of improving our relations with our trading partners. It is vital. In this area, we are not standing still, we are losing ground. Our negotiators lack any credibility at the bargaining table without the trade bill. No progress is being made on trade issues today. I, therefore, strongly urge that the House vote on the trade bill this year and that the administration support our taking this step.

LONGMONT, COLORADO'S TOTAL VOLUNTEER BLOOD DONOR PROGRAM

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been concerned about the health problems caused by transfusions of infected blood. Earlier in the year I reintroduced the National Blood Bank Act which has, as its goal, the virtual elimination of infected blood transfusions by 1980. The bill would accomplish this through the formulation of a national campaign to encourage the voluntary donation of blood and through the regulation of blood banking by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Officials at HEW are already evidencing their concern and have undertaken efforts to administratively remove the threat of infected blood. Also, I understand that hearings may be held next year on the legislation I have introduced.

Some communities, to their credit, are not waiting for congressional or administrative action. They are moving ahead with their own volunteer blood programs. In fact, one city in my district, Longmont, already has a totally volunteer

blood donor program. What this means is that no resident of Longmont, whether hospitalized in Longmont or elsewhere, needs to be concerned with blood replacement.

The successful effort in Longmont was undertaken as a project of the Longmont division of the Women's Auxiliary to the Boulder County Medical Society. While the auxiliary, under the leadership of Mrs. Severance B. Kelley and Mrs. Robert E. Miller, organized the effort, it should be noted that other sectors of the community cooperated to make the program a success.

The Longmont program does not cover blood service charges, but it does cover the replacement of all whole blood and blood components. This is done at no cost to anyone. Arrangements are made for a mobile unit from the Belle Bonfils Memorial Blood Bank of Denver to come to Longmont as often as is necessary to provide an adequate community pool. In addition, the auxiliary provides all of the volunteer help required to arrange for an adequate number of donors, and it provides personnel to assist the professional staff during the actual collection of blood. The local news media and the community at large have responded positively every time the mobile unit has been brought to Longmont.

On December 14, Boulder, Colo., will have its first community-wide volunteer donation program. It will be coordinated by the Boulder members of the Medical Society Auxiliary, and it will serve a geographic area adjoining that served by the Longmont program.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the members of the Longmont Medical Society Auxiliary are to be commended for their efforts. I hope that other communities throughout the country will emulate their outstanding work. It is imperative that the American public be protected from the skidrow blood peddlers. At the same time, we must see that enough blood is available so that those who need transfusions will be able to get them. Longmont is one place where these two important objectives are being met.

HE FED US STRENGTH

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, seldom it is that I rise before the House to speak on matters other than pending legislative business or issues currently on substantive import to the welfare of the Nation. Rarer still, do I use this forum to discuss matters of personal import.

However, today, with a heavy heart, and sorrow shared by many thousands in New York City, and across the Nation, I rise to say some few words to the memory of Dr. Arthur Logan of Harlem.

Arthur has been eulogized in loving words, in poetry, and in music. All those of whatever racial, ethnic, religious, social, and political amalgam—those who were welcome to the home of Arthur and

Marian Logan—all join with me in expressing our loss and our love for this gentle but strong example of black leadership at its very finest.

Mr. Speaker, the question of leadership is very much in the public mind today. Americans are struggling to redefine the values that make up leadership worthy of the name. The example of Arthur Logan is certainly one of the guideposts that all Americans can look to in our seeking for the substance and undertaking the effectiveness of true leadership.

Arthur's leadership was an example. Whether it was climbing five flights of stairs to treat the sick, old woman at the back of the tenement, or turning impressive testimonials to himself into fund-raising events for one of his many charitable interests, or providing the warmth of his home as a sympathetic forum for those needing to express themselves in the fields of art, science, philosophy, religion or politics—all these Arthur Logan did, and did in a quiet, but terribly effective way.

Arthur Logan was the kind of leader that John Kennedy liked. Indeed, they both had much in common. They pursued and achieved lives of personal excellence and public service. They felt things very deeply. They loved and suffered much in striving and achieving.

It is easy to think that those who live their lives of self-sacrifice and devotion with quiet style and distinction, have an easy time of it. But it takes a strong love and an equally strong will to continue to give yourself—day after day—year after year—decade after decade.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I use the title of an article appearing in this morning's Washington Post to begin these words of tribute to Arthur Logan. True it is that Arthur "Fed Us Strength." Arthur's strength of soul and purpose have fed us in past times of sorrow and trial—that strength must sustain his family and all of us now to bear this loss.

I pray that God may take this man of love under His own mantle of love and grant him fullness of life. I also pray for the comforting of his wife, Marian, his children, Adele and Warren, and all his family and friends. Helen, my wife, and our children join in this prayer.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks, I include in the RECORD the obituary from the New York Times of November 29, and the Roger Wilkins article from the Washington Post of November 30.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 29, 1973]

DR. ARTHUR C. LOGAN DIES; SURGEON AND CIVIC LEADER

Dr. Arthur C. Logan, a board member of the city Health and Hospitals Corporation and a well-known physician and surgeon, fell to his death yesterday from a viaduct of the Henry Hudson Parkway in upper Manhattan.

Dr. Logan, who was 64 years old, was widely regarded for his support of and personal involvement in many national civil rights causes. He was active in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and the National Urban League.

His dedication to public service was known throughout the country. He was the object of numerous public tributes, which he

often managed to transform into fund-raising events for one of his many causes. Such was the case with a testimonial dinner given in his honor at the Plaza Hotel three years ago, the proceeds of which were donated to Knickerbocker Hospital, where he was a member of the board.

A handsome, silver-haired man with a soft smile, Dr. Logan headed the city's poverty programs—as chairman of the Council Against Poverty—during the most turbulent days of the mid-sixties. He was also chairman of Haryou-ACT, an organization attempting to help disadvantaged young people get education and jobs.

AUTOPSY TODAY

Detective Sgt. Frank Clento of the Fifth Detective District homicide squad said his men had reported that the death "appeared to be a suicide," but he added that the case was still under investigation.

The police found the body at about 8:30 A.M. on the pavement at West 134th Street and 12th Avenue, about 100 feet below the viaduct. An automobile registered in Dr. Logan's name was found parked and located in the southbound lane of the Parkway.

The police said there was no evidence to suspect foul play. Dr. Logan's papers and some money were found intact, they reported, and the car keys were in his pocket. The city's Chief Medical Examiner, Milton Helpen, said an autopsy was scheduled for today.

Identification of the body was made by the widow, Mrs. Marian Bruce Logan, who was accompanied by Percy E. Sutton, Manhattan Borough President.

Mr. Sutton said he had talked to Dr. Logan at length on Saturday. He told Dr. Logan that the way had finally been cleared for the relocation of a city bus depot now at Amsterdam Avenue and West 129th Street near Knickerbocker Hospital. The relocation of the terminal would allow for the expansion of the hospital—a move that Dr. Logan had been seeking for several years.

Mr. Sutton said that Dr. Logan had told his wife before leaving home that he was going to the hospital, at 70 Convent Avenue, and then to look at the new bus terminal site, on 12th Avenue between 133d and 134th Streets, near where his body was later discovered.

"The last thing in the world this guy would do would be to commit suicide. He had everything going for him and nothing against him," Mr. Sutton said.

Mayor Lindsay, who like former Mayor Wagner before him, had named Dr. Logan to a number of committees serving the city, issued a statement calling him "a civic leader of extraordinary intelligence and devotion who somehow found the time and energy to express the widest range of social conditions while carrying the full load of medical practice and involvement in the medical community."

Governor Rockefeller said last night: "The death of Dr. Logan is a great tragedy and a profound loss to the community. He was an outstanding physician, a leader in efforts to broaden the availability of medical care in New York City and an important figure in the civil rights movement. He was a personal friend and I mourn his passing."

DR. KING'S PHYSICIAN

One of the first black graduates of Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons, Dr. Logan acted as personal physician to many noted people, including the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Duke Ellington. During the Poor People's March on Washington in 1967, he mobilized a medical team to treat the demonstrators camped out in tents in "Resurrection City."

He was one of the original partners in the Upper Manhattan Medical Group, serving the community in lower Washington Heights for more than 20 years. In addition, he found

time to be active in his West Side neighborhood, helping to form an organization to lobby against what the group saw as the overbuilding of low-income housing in the West Side Urban Renewal Area. He lived at 1865 Amsterdam Avenue.

Dr. Logan was born in Tuskegee, Ala., where his father was treasurer of Tuskegee Institute. He graduated from Williams College.

Besides his wife, Dr. Logan is survived by a daughter, Mrs. Adele Logan Alexander of Washington; a 10-year-old son, Warren Arthur; two brothers, Harold K. Logan of Tuskegee and Paul H. Logan of Lafayette, Calif., and two sisters, Miss Louise T. Logan and Mrs. Myra Logan Alston, both of New York.

[From The Washington Post, Nov. 30, 1973]

"HE FED US STRENGTH"

(By Roger Wilkins)

Arthur Logan is dead. That doesn't mean much to most folks, but when Arthur died the other day, the amount of good in the world dropped perceptibly. He was that much of a man.

Arthur was a black man with white skin, light eyes, straight hair and a sense of black power that came not from mindless exhilaration at some rally, but from a powerful and sustained love of black people. He was a 64-year-old Harlem doctor who showed all the signs of bourgeois achievement that the young black radicals said they hated so much. Arthur lived well. He had a nice house in Manhattan, but he wasn't rich and didn't seem to care to be. His daughter went to Radcliffe, came to Washington with her husband, moved with him through the Kennedy-Johnson White Houses to live with grace and style in this town. Arthur and his last wife, Marion, ran the most eclectic and exciting informal salon in Manhattan. One night it might be pork chops, good wine and Murray Kempton. The next it would be pigs knuckles and Martin Luther King. Arthur usually cooked the meat.

So, where's the black power in that? Arthur sure didn't shout, "Black Power!" And, if he had, people would have laughed—he was too white. Adam Powell—ruddy white with flowing hair—once clapped Arthur to his bosom and said, "Us black folks got to stick together." They gleamed white together. It was absurd, but absolutely real. Each man, in his own way, knew precisely about the pain in the black psyche and touched it as best he could through the foreshortened days of his life. Each man paid a price. Each of them is dead.

Arthur Logan was a lot of things. He was certainly a "civic leader." And he was also one of those "first Negroes." There is all the stuff for solid obituaries—member of the board of the New York City Health and Hospitals corporation, chairman of the New York Poverty Corporation, chairman of Haryou Act, founding member of the Upper Manhattan Medical Group, son of the treasurer of Tuskegee Institute, one of the first blacks to go through Williams College and then go on to graduate from Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons—and so on. That's all good enough to make him an honored poobah, but the question persists, where's the black power?

It was in the love. Arthur didn't have to wait until 1966 to learn to respect himself, to learn to love other black people or to know the honor that comes from patiently and carefully putting building blocks into place in black communities for decent things that he might never see. He knew about the diseases in black folks' bodies and of the pain in their hearts. He doctored on the first and "pastored" to the other.

Percy Sutton, the black borough president of Manhattan, said, a couple of days ago, "Arthur was the glue. We hurt and he gave. So we asked some more. He fed us strength and we got the headlines. He may have been the best of all."

Arthur looked at Harlem and saw people needlessly sick, so he became the apostle of preventive medicine. He'd look at the whole family and knew there was a need for comprehensive treatment so he pushed for the creation of a medical group that could treat a child or a grandpa or one man's eyes, toes and liver all in one fell swoop. The dream of his last years was a drastic expansion of hospital facilities for the people of West Harlem. Nobody had to preach the gospel of "black community" to Arthur. He lived it—and he didn't have to. He could have taken his medical degree and fled the pain to affluent stupefaction. Most black doctors of his generation did that with no compunction.

So there was that—patience and institution building in a black community for days he might not see and for people he did not know. But there was more. There was the "pastoring."

Rep. Andrew Young (D-Ga.), once one of Martin Luther King's closest aides, said that when Dr. King was down and in trouble, he would go to Arthur. "Arthur was one of the few people who could pastor to Martin," Young said. "It wasn't talk about strategy and all of that, it was when Martin felt bad about not seeing his kids enough—things that were deep and that hurt him. That's when he would go to Arthur." And so did Duke Ellington and Whitney Young, Jackie Robinson, Bayard Rustin—and hundreds of other blacks who nobody ever heard about, but who were stretched almost to the breaking point and needed patching up in order to do the next day's battle.

And he nourished young blacks. One night at a party at his house, he got a young black woman, who no one there then knew, to play the piano and to sing some songs. When she sat, Arthur said to Ellington, "Duke, this is the girl I told you about. Now listen." The maestro's heavily bagged eyes narrowed to a weary and sophisticated slit. He nodded and wasn't interested—until the music started. Then Duke became young, interested and an instant fan. He may have helped her on her way, for all I know. At least it was clear that was what was in Arthur's mind. "The first time ever I saw his face," she sang. She worked then at Mr. Henry's up on the Hill, and pretty soon everybody knew about Roberta Flack.

But, there wasn't just music at that house. There was talk, too. If you wanted to raise money to fight the drug traffic in Harlem, help make Charlie Evans the first black mayor in Mississippi, send some black South African kid to school, help Martin march across Alabama or do anything that touched the heartstrings and built the world, all you had to do was to call Arthur and Marion. They would open their doors, provide the booze and let the speakin' begin. After it was over, they would put their son, Chip, to bed and lay the first cash money on the line.

So that was Arthur. The kind of fellow who would get out of bed at two in the morning to see some sick black person. It might be Martin and it might be some nameless old lady five flights up who nobody else cared enough to see. They were black and they needed love, so he went. It was all the same to him.

Black power to you, Arthur Logan.

**HONOR ZION BANK PRESIDENT
ROSS BURGESS**

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, on December 12, 1973, my long-time friend,

Ross A. Burgess, president of Zion State Bank & Trust Co., Zion, Ill., will complete 50 years of banking service. No citizen in the 13th Congressional District of Illinois enjoys a better reputation for business integrity and devoted community service than Ross Burgess.

Mr. Speaker, in recounting Ross Burgess' 50 years of outstanding service, I would like to recount the experiences which have culminated in the prominent role he attained as one of the most successful and honored bankers of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, a half-century ago, a 19-year-old Zion youth was talked into trying his hand at banking. Today, that young man, Ross A. Burgess, is the third president of the Zion State Bank & Trust Co., which is a leading financial institution in Lake County. Ross joined the staff of the then "Zion Bank" on the advice of the cashier of the bank, William L. Bull, known to most Zion residents as Deacon Bull.

Ross had wanted to be an apprentice in the bricklayers' union when Deacon Bull convinced him that he should "try his hand at banking." Ross originally had looked toward bricklaying because it was the trade of his father. However, once Ross decided to become a banker, he went about it with all the energy that has become the mark of this great Zion resident. He enrolled in the American Institute of Banking in Chicago, attending evening classes for 9 years until, in 1937, he gained his standard certificate. Not satisfied, Ross furthered his education as a banker in later years by earning another certificate after three summer sessions at the Central States School of Banking at the University of Wisconsin.

Banker Burgess has served as president of the Lake County Federation of Bankers, and as president of the Northwestern Illinois Conference of the National Association of Bank Auditors and Comptrollers.

During his 50 years of service, Ross A. Burgess served as assistant cashier, cashier, vice president, and finally in 1952, became president of the Zion State Bank. However, he had been the chief executive officer since 1936. During the period from 1936, and largely because of his abilities as a banker and a community leader, the resources of the Zion State Bank climbed from less than a half million dollars in 1936 to more than \$58 million today.

Mr. Speaker, as a banker, Burgess is considered a true professional leader by his peers. An associate once said:

Ross Burgess is one of the most intelligent, imaginative, resourceful, judicious, and honest people I have ever known in or out of business.

However, banking has not been his only contribution to the community. Besides being a business leader, he also has been a civic leader. He served two terms with distinction on the Zion City Council, and was primarily responsible for a vital million dollar street improvement program. Also he has served the Christian Catholic Church as chairman of the board; has been a justice of the peace; was twice president of the chamber of commerce; was treasurer of a number of school districts; was a member of the

Lake County Crime Commission, a member of the Lake County Public Water District Board and president of the Zion Hospital. During all this period, he also has been an active member of the Christian Catholic Church Choir, and served at times as its director. He has sung in the choir for 62 years.

Never one to duck public service, Burgess has worked on countless committees for civic, and charitable organizations in Northeastern Illinois. In addition, he has influenced many of the men and women who work at the Zion State Bank to become involved in community and governmental affairs. There is hardly a local governmental unit or business, civic, or church organization which has not had or does not have, at least one employee of the Zion State Bank serving in some important role.

Ross Burgess has a profound respect for our Nation's honored traditions. A graphic manifestation of this, is the bank's Heritage room, a public meeting room containing historic reminders of the great heritage of his community, State, and Nation. It was his personal guidance and foresight which brought the Heritage room to fruition in the bank's last remodeling in 1970. Another expansion of the bank in 1974, also will bear the mark of Ross Burgess' thoughtful planning. His attention to detail and his grasp of modern banking concepts leave no doubt in the minds of his associates or his competitors that Ross not only has respect for tradition, but also is one of the most progressive bankers in the midwest.

Many area residents have called Ross Burgess a "good, wise and courageous man," because under his direction and leadership many others have been helped to establish successful businesses.

Mr. Speaker, we are all glad that back in 1923, W. J. "Deacon" Bull talked a prospective bricklayer into trying his hand at banking. For throughout 50 years as a banker and civic leader, Ross A. Burgess, like the Zion State Bank, has become an institution.

Mr. Speaker, Ross Burgess is being honored at a testimonial dinner on December 15, by the officers and directors of the bank, as well as many persons prominent in the community and public life of our area. I am privileged to be one of those who will be present to honor Ross Burgess on that occasion. In addition, I will be acknowledging the steadfast devotion and help which has been provided by his faithful wife, Jessie. The testimonial dinner has been arranged by my friend, Jim Hotham, who has succeeded Ross Burgess as president of the Zion State Bank & Trust Co.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I carry to this meeting your good wishes, as well as those of my colleagues in this great House of Representatives. I am proud, indeed, to call public attention to Ross A. Burgess's outstanding career of service.

PUBLIC FINANCING FOR CAMPAIGNS

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. HARVEY. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, this House took decisive action, in my judgment, in sending back to the Senate the public debt limit measure because that body had included in it nongermane legislation in the form of S. 372, dealing with campaign reform and spending. I supported House Resolution 721, which was passed overwhelmingly by 347 to 54, objecting to such legislative procedure.

There is no question that the House will deal with the vital subject of campaign financing and reform in a proper way. I note that it is probable that we will be voting on such recommendations early in the next session of the 93d Congress.

Because of the subject matter and the fact that it ranks among the highest priority items that this Congress must deal with in the weeks and months ahead, I want to bring to your attention an extremely able and thorough statement on public financing for elective Federal offices. This is a statement delivered by our colleague, Congressman BILL FRENZEL, before the Subcommittee on Elections of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration on September 19, 1973. I have not seen or read over a more detailed statement on this subject.

I earnestly urge all Members to read over this very sound and expert statement by Congressman FRENZEL, which follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN BILL FRENZEL

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for this opportunity to testify on the timely and significant subject of public financing.

The crisis of confidence in government, specifically the Watergate affair, has given great thrust to proposals for public financing of federal elections. Often, the popular image of such plans is that they will magically and instantly purify elections and relieve elected officials of any and all pressures and taints of "dirty money."

Everyone embraces the concept of clean, honest and open elections, but the important question is whether or not public financing is in fact a workable, or exclusive, means to move toward better elections. In the aftermath of Watergate, the principle and idea of public financing of elections may seem appealing to many people. But will it be nearly so appealing if and when it is implemented?

In particular, will public financing bring a halt to the corrosive effect that the wealthy, special and vested interest often have on the political process? Is it administratively workable? What implications and ramifications does it have for the electoral process? The political parties? The candidates? Political action committees? Incumbents? More importantly, will it actually increase public confidence in the American political process.*

POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS: SOURCE OF POWER

The concept of public financing is often considered the most compelling argument in its favor. Some proponents believe public financing will rid the political process of the corrupting and harmful effects of private and corporate wealth. This belief is usually based on the assertion that the special and vested interests are powerful because they have the wealth to make large political contributions. While wealthy individuals and groups do make significant political contributions, and while these groups and individuals do have considerable influence over the decision making process, it does not necessarily follow that contributions are a primary or important source of their influence and power.

At least two underlying assumptions of proponents of public financing are more myth than fact. They need to be challenged: 1. that special and vested interests dominate the political process to the exclusion of the public interest and that their wealth automatically translates into political power; and 2. that the influence of these interests is a direct function of campaign contributions or the amount of cash they pour into campaign coffers.

1. The assertion that the political process is dominated by the wealthy, vested interests to the exclusion of the public interest is misleading and an over-simplified view of the realities of our democratic processes. While there are numerous examples in which heavily financed interest groups have obtained tax loopholes, subsidies and other government favors, there are also many instances where these interest groups have been frustrated in their attempts to obtain legislation favorable to their interest or to block legislation that was unfavorable. For example, in recent years, there has been:

The defeat of the aerospace lobby in the battle over the SST;

*NOTE.—There are numerous, different proposals for the public financing of elections. They range from complete public financing, to optional public financing to partial public financing to the tax check-off system to matching grants for small contributions. It is almost impossible to make generalizations about the strengths and weaknesses of all of these proposals. This testimony will try to explore some of the conceptual weaknesses and difficulties in implementation of public financing schemes in general. Based on this overall and general analysis, some criticisms of specific programs will be offered. All of the general criticisms do not apply to all of the specific public financing proposals, but rather attempt to point out and illustrate some of the possible pitfalls of public financing.

Supporters of public financing will claim that some of the problems mentioned in this testimony are inherent in private financing plans and not in the concept and implementation of public financing. However, it seems reasonable to assume that if a system of public financing is going to meet constitutional requirements, it will have to be an integrated approach containing private funding as well. An outright ban on private contributions would be an unreasonable and unconstitutional limitation on rights of free speech and expression. Consequently, any system of public financing will have many of the same problems as private financing, in addition to those created by increased federal involvement in the political process.

Reduction of the oil depletion allowance in the 1969 Tax Reform Act in the face of strong industry opposition;

Active government efforts to clean up our waters, launched over the intense opposition of industries such as paper and chemicals;

Passage of Medicare in 1965 in the face of an all-out AMA mobilization against the bill;

Enactment of stringent air pollution control standards regarding auto emissions despite the opposition of the auto industry;

Justice Department consent decree requiring ITT to divest a half-dozen major subsidiaries acquired in mergers, despite its vast financial resources and an intense campaign to get the case dropped;

Opening of the highway trust fund in spite of extensive lobbying efforts by the highway lobbies.

Nor have these been isolated incidents. Defense and space funding have experienced steady relative declines, despite heavy lobbying and spending by the so-called "military-industrial" complex, while spending for health, education and welfare programs has soared, doubling to around \$100 billion.

These examples are not meant to be an attempt to obfuscate the sometimes excessive and occasionally overwhelming power of the vested interests, but rather they are an effort to place the influence of the special interests vs. the public interest into a more realistic perspective.

2. One of the underlying assumptions of supporters of public financing is that dollars automatically translate into political power, and that each vested interest's success is dependent on the amount of its campaign contribution. Recent episodes like the ITT affair, the Vesco caper, the recent textile import limitation and the quick burial of the Presidential Task Force recommendation that oil quotas be phased out all provide impressionistic and anecdotal support for this thesis. However, before a theory or explanation can be accepted, it must have broad or general applicability. It must explain almost all of the cases, or even a significant number of cases, associated with a problem, rather than just conveniently selected anecdotes. Viewed in the light of the above-mentioned exceptions, the stereotyped notion that campaign dollars are automatically translated into special interest legislation or governmental decisions does not hold up. Also, to the extent that campaign contributions do strengthen the hand of the special interest groups, it must be recognized that this includes professional groups, small businesses, labor, farm and education groups as well as large corporations and wealthy individuals.

In addition, if most or many of the elected federal officials are "tools" of the special and vested interests, or are "bought" by these interests at election time by the highest bidder, we might expect that there would be a glut of money for political campaigns and that political candidates receive many more offers of money in return for influence than they can possibly use in a political campaign.

In fact, politics is generally underfinanced. Politicians and their committees must actively solicit campaign contributions.

Some of the recent abuses occurred when political candidates or their aides were said to have coerced, arm-twisted and extorted money because they believed that they did not have sufficient funds to win the election. Some of the individuals and organizations who were "arm-twisted" contributed more out of fear of retaliation on the part of these powerful officials, than in the hope of "buying" power. If all a candidate had to do was to sell himself to the highest bidder, he would not need to use coercive tactics to obtain contributions.

At this point, proponents might argue that

public financing is necessary to ensure that the political process is adequately financed and to eliminate instances of coercion. They would have a very valid point if public financing proposals would increase the amount of funds available to the political process. However, as will be noted later at greater length, almost all of the present proposals would actually reduce the amount of money used in political campaigns.

Furthermore, it is almost impossible to measure the impact of political gifts and contributions on the decision making process, as Dr. Alexander Heard has noted:

The inherent power of immense concentrations of wealth in a nation exists without regard to the particular ways political party and candidate activities are paid for . . . It becomes an incredibly difficult task to distinguish between the impact of political gifts that emanate from large and small pools of wealth and the impact of other means of influence that such concentrations of economic power inevitably command . . .

Special interest influence is a problem, but campaign contributions are only one of many contributing factors. In fact, political contributions may not be a major or primary source of power for the special and vested interests. There are at least three other factors that are important and significant sources of their power and influence.

1. The producer groups (usually the special and vested interests) have an inherent advantage over consumer groups (usually the general public). Specifically, producer groups have more time and greater resources which allow them to develop the following attributes that give them an important edge in the struggle for political power:

Specialized knowledge and expertise in the complex and technical matters in which governmental decisions are required;

Professional staff and representatives possessing knowledge of the governmental processes, and access to the key people who make the decisions;

A large stake in the limited range of issues that affect their interest, thus allowing for maximum mobilization of resources at the appropriate time and place;

A certain "legitimacy", because the parties most affected by a governmental action should have a large role in determining the outcome;

Organization networks and structures that facilitate articulation and forceful presentation of their views to both the public and the relevant government decision makers.

For example, if a public utility wants an increase in rates, it has the time and resources to invest a considerable amount of effort in a campaign to obtain governmental approval. It can develop information that will demonstrate the great need for such an increase. The utility knows the process by which to obtain approval and can easily contact the proper people and decision-makers. Having a huge stake in the issue, the entire corporation's resources can be mobilized for this particular effort. Since the company is greatly affected by the possible increase, the government must listen and weigh its case.

2. Political parties in the United States are relatively weak, broadbased and decentralized. In many other democratic nations, the parties provide a stronger focus and rallying point for the consumer or public interest. The influential special and vested interests in the United States are not often challenged by the political parties. The main check on their powers are the other, conflicting, influential special and vested interests.

3. Even more importantly, the United States has a highly fragmented, governmental structure. Decisions on particular issues are focused in legislative committees

and subcommittees and in executive agencies and bureaus. With the possible exception of the Office of Management and Budget, there is no overall budget control mechanism, no overall view of the allocation of national priorities, and no central agency that can shape and define national public policy. Each special and vested interest merely must concentrate its resources on a handful of committees, agencies or bureaucracies to obtain governmental favors and assistance. Meanwhile, more broadly-based groups, such as the consumer and the public interest groups, face the difficult job of monitoring and overseeing dozens of committees hundreds of departments, agencies and bureaucracies, and hundreds of thousands of state and local political entities.

Given these other factors, public financing may fall completely to curb the "excessive and corrosive" influence of the special and vested interests. Certainly, it will not eliminate or drastically reduce their power and influence.

FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT

Public financing would involve the use of federal funds in the electoral process to a greater extent than ever before. Increased federal funding may result in greater federal control. The likelihood of federal manipulation of elections in the future, especially with an independent elections commission, is not great, but the possibilities of such interference should not be overlooked. The recent revelations of the misdoings of trusted White House aides in trying to circumvent laws by recruiting CIA help for domestic operations and using the FBI to gather political information illustrates the real possibilities of unwarranted interference that public financing might create.

Here are some of the ways public financing might open the electoral process to manipulation by the federal government: (1) The federal government could set conditions on the candidate's qualifications over and above those already in existence. For various reasons, it could refuse to give federal funds to candidates who were allegedly in "violation" of the law, classified as "subversive", or who were actively opposed to the major parties or the party in power. (2) The federal government could force parties to conform to federal rules and regulations and might eventually gain control of them. (3) Incumbents could purposefully appropriate small amounts of money for political campaigns, thereby making it impossible for the challenger to wage an effective campaign and assuring themselves of victory. (4) Congress and the President might be unable to agree upon how much money to appropriate, in which case there might be little or no funds for political campaigns. (5) The federal agency in charge of administering public financing might manipulate the electoral process. It could amend the law by rule without Congress knowing exactly what changes were being made. For example, Congress recently amended the federal income tax check-off system, designed to finance presidential elections. Some Congressmen thought they were simply amending the law to insure that the check-off provisions would appear on the front page of personal income tax returns. However, some of them later found out that they also had amended the law to require that the funds be divided evenly among the two parties. A complicated public finance law might provide similar opportunities for federal agency manipulation of the electoral process.

In addition to the problems of federal control, public funding of political campaigns raises significant questions about the proper allocation of national priorities. Will the federal government be deprived of valuable funds that could be used more effectively in other areas of greater national priority?

Senator Mansfield and others say that public financing should be of the highest priority, but others, including myself, disagree. Even though the sums of money involved is not great relatively speaking, why should the taxpayers' money be used when the needs can be raised privately?

It may be very difficult to set forth a workable proposal for enforcement of a public financing law. Some proponents say that it will be administered and enforced by an independent elections commission or other independent federal agency. What will ensure its independence? Non-partisanship under a plan of public financing might be especially important. The commission or agency could literally have life and death powers over all candidates, because it might control the source of much or most of the funding. What guarantee would there be that the independent elections commission or other federal agency would not develop ways of manipulating election processes for the benefit of one of the parties or several of the candidates? What would prevent an incumbent President from vetoing or an incumbent Congress from refusing to appropriate money for political campaigns, thereby insuring their own re-election?

FEDERAL VS. PRIVATE FUNDS

In support of public financing, proponents assert that private fund raising is a humiliating and degrading experience that political candidates should not be forced to face. While fund raising can be difficult and occasionally embarrassing, proponents fail to recognize its value as a barometer of: (1) a candidate's popular support, (2) public approval of his record while in office, and (3) his seriousness about serving in public office. Furthermore, many public financing proposals might put candidates, especially incumbents, in a position where they would have to do very little to get elected.

The voracity with which some supporters assert that fund raising is a degrading experience may suggest an unwillingness to present their record to the public and a lack of interest in one of the most important aspects of our political process—political campaigning. While the ballot box is an essential means of measuring popular support for a candidate, political contributions give individuals and groups an opportunity to register strong approval and disapproval of a particular candidate or party.

Congress should be leery of spending the taxpayers' hard-earned money on the inane paraphernalia and mindless sloganeering that are now a part of some political campaigns even though most campaign expenditures might be good, effective and legitimate uses of public funds. Consequently, Congress should be sure that there is not another, cheaper, easier way to obtain the same goals sought by public financing. In particular, a strong, vigorous system of enforcement of contribution limitations would be much less expensive and could achieve the same results.

The abandonment of private financing will not necessarily end campaign abuses. Under public financing, those who are dishonest might still find means of circumventing the law. Events such as Watergate might still occur, because they may be not just a reflection of the way in which we finance our campaigns, but of a mentality and set of attitudes that will persist even with the advent of public financing.

Private financing does have many advantages. It has helped elect politicians of all political philosophies. With proper contribution and spending limits, wealthy candidates need have no special advantages.

Also, private financing functions in a manner similar to the free market. It has been one of the traditional ways of determining the popularity and attractiveness of a candidate. Popular candidates rarely

have a shortage of funds, while unpopular candidates are usually unable to raise large amounts of funds. Many public financing proposals would give equal amounts of funds to both types of candidates, thereby discriminating against those who are more popular.

ARE PRESENT PROPOSALS FOR PUBLIC FINANCING EQUITABLE AND WORKABLE?

Many of the present proposals for public financing make an implicit assumption: that the diversity of the American political process can be made to conform to a single scheme of public financing. Few of the proposals for public financing are contoured to meet the many peculiarities and idiosyncracies of the states and localities. For example, if third party or fringe candidates were required to obtain a certain number of signatures in order to be eligible for public financing (as is the case in one public financing scheme), such a formula might be discriminatory.

There are numerous other similar situations. If a security deposit were to be required for eligibility, a rich candidate might have no trouble finding a dozen or fifty rich friends to put up \$250 each for the deposit. On the other hand, a poor candidate might not know enough wealthy people to obtain the funds needed for the deposit.

More importantly, most public financing proposals severely limit the amount a candidate can spend, generally in the range of \$50,000 to \$100,000 per Congressional district or 15¢ to 20¢ per eligible voter. In some states (such as Connecticut), this sum would hardly pay for two or three one-minute television spots, while in rural southern states this sum would be more than a candidate could realistically ever hope to spend. Yet, in both instances, candidates would receive exactly the same amount of federal money.

In addition, these strict limitations are said to help the challenger in the Senate, but in the House of Representatives, they tend to help the incumbent. For example, in the 1972 races, the incumbents in the Senate outspent their rivals by over two to one. Several of the challengers who won expressed the belief that strict limitations would have benefited them and hurt the incumbent. Yet, in the House it is often necessary to spend a huge sum of money to overcome the name identification that an incumbent has. Few of the present public financing schemes take these paradoxical circumstances into account.

Private funds tend to gravitate toward races that are important and hotly contested. Unimportant races and contests in which only one candidate has a serious chance of winning do not attract large amounts of private money. However, under public financing, money could be equally distributed. For example, the 80% of the House districts which are relatively uncontested might receive a total of approximately four times more money than the 20% that are hotly contested. This would be a misallocation of federal resources. Close, important races would be inadequately funded, while many of the relatively unimportant races would be over-funded.

Under a system of public financing, a one-shot or minor party might poll sufficient votes in an election to assure a sizeable subsidy in the next campaign. By the time of the next election, it is feasible that such a party would have spent its fury and be virtually extinct. Yet, it would receive several million dollars which it could decide to spend in a squandering fashion.

What effect will public financing have on the thousands of federal, state and local election laws now on the books? What will happen if the federal government is a major source of campaign funding? Will the importance of lobbying increase greatly? Proponents of public financing have not fully examined and discussed the possible impact of their idea on the diverse, pluralist political system in America.

IMPACT ON THE POLITICAL PARTIES

There are three main ways of distributing federal funds for campaigns: (1) directly to the political party, (2) directly to the candidate, and (3) a mixture of the first two.

Under the first alternative, more power would be placed in the hands of the parties and their national committees. Since they would be the primary or only source of funds, the national committees might use the money to keep party candidates and incumbents in line. Party dissidents and independents could be shortchanged when the funds are passed out and could be pressured into adopting the party line. Because the political parties would no longer be dependent on private sources, public financing could make political parties, presently the political entities with the most broadly based popular support, less responsive to the American people. Former Sen. Joseph Tydings, in opposing public financing for political parties, has stated:

"Parties should not derive their financing because they have the support of the government. In our free party system, political parties have grown and prospered according to the amount of public support they could command for their candidates and programs, not according to the amount they can cajole from the Congress."

Several years ago, the late Sen. Robert Kennedy noted one of the harmful consequences of publicly-financed parties:

"To aid campaigns by direct subsidy from the Treasury would only further separate the individual citizen from the political process—insulating the party organization from any need to reach citizens, except through the one-way communication of television and advertising. The political parties would talk to the citizen; but the individual could not talk back."

Under the second alternative, whereby the subsidy is given directly to the candidate, the power of the candidates would be greatly increased and the parties would be drastically weakened. By giving money directly to the candidate, a system of public financing would encourage third party and splinter candidates, because the political parties would have much less control over who ran. Over a period of time, the two-party system as we know it might be destroyed and the two major parties might become seriously enough weakened that coalition governments would become necessary. Coalitions and parties might divide along ideological lines, which could greatly increase political conflict and threaten the stability of the political process.

The third and best alternative would be to give funds to both parties and candidates. However, this system would be much more costly, and it might be most difficult to find a formula that would maintain an equitable balance between candidates and parties. Before a public financing plan is actually implemented, it might be impossible to ascertain whether it will maintain this delicate balance. If a seriously-imbalanced formula were to be implemented initially, it might be impossible to change it. If the initial formula favors the candidates and weakens the parties, candidates would be elected who are very independent of the party system, and who would resist efforts to redress the imbalance in favor of strong parties. If the original formula favors the parties, candidates would be elected who are strong party men and who would resist efforts that might aid independent candidates.

Proponents of public financing have failed to arrive at a workable, fair and equitable formula for third and minor parties. They have failed to derive a formula that would make it fairly difficult, but still quite feasible for a third party to receive federal funding. A system (e.g. use of petitions) that might work well for qualifying third and minor parties in California and Oregon might fail miserably in New York and Vermont. A sys-

tem (e.g. security deposit) that might cause a proliferation of third party and splinter party candidates in one area (e.g. Westchester County) might make it extremely difficult for a third or splinter party to get federal financing in another nearby area (e.g. South Bronx). Proponents have also failed to come up with a formula that will distribute funds fairly and equitably among major and minor parties.

The treatment of major, minor and third parties raises substantial constitutional questions. Under a system of public financing, must minority parties be guaranteed equal protection? If they are, they would have to receive as much or more than major parties. This would cause a proliferation of minor parties. If they are not given equal protection, the system may be declared unconstitutional. Even if a minor or third party is given as much as a major party, it may still be discriminatory, because the minor party must spend more if it is to do well in an election. To limit the amount a new, minor or third party can receive from the federal treasury to as much as or less than the amount for major parties might severely cripple the ability of these parties to wage successful campaigns. Furthermore, there are ample legal precedents against arbitrary classifications of this nature.

EFFECT ON THE CANDIDATES

Critics of public financing have for years claimed that a federal subsidy would encourage a rash of frivolous candidates who enter just to get a subsidy. Recently, proponents have offered several possible remedies for this possibility. So far, they have come up with three main ways of limiting frivolous, "kook" candidates who might run for office as an exciting ego-trip, without much thought of winning or serving.

1. Federal assistance could be limited to candidates able to present petitions signed by a large enough percentage of the electorate to show the candidate's seriousness and a significant degree of popular support.

There are several problems with this proposal. Each state has different requirements for petition signatures. In at least one state, for example, all signatures on a petition are invalid if one signature is invalid. In other states, each candidate's petitions and every signature can be challenged. Name and addresses will be illegible. If only registered voters can sign, many people may not know they are unregistered. Complications in the law and challenges to the laws may slow down processing and verification procedures until the entire election is over. A system of this nature would only bring confusion and chaos to the electoral process.

2. Candidates receiving federal assistance may be required to post a bond or security deposit that would be forfeited if they failed to gain a certain percentage of the vote. For example, under the Hart bill, all would-be candidates who want federal funds would be required to put up a "security deposit" equal to one-fifth of the expected subsidy in order to be eligible for public financing. No individual or organization would be allowed to put up more than \$250 toward the security deposit. If a candidate wanted to receive \$50,000, he would have to find at least 40 people to put up \$250 or less apiece in order to receive his subsidy. If the candidate received only 5-10% of the vote, he would lose his deposit. If he received less than 5% of the vote, he would lose the subsidy and his deposit.

This proposal might discriminate against candidates from poorer areas who might not know 20, 40 or 100 people who can afford to put up \$250 for a campaign. It could also discourage independent candidates who might not want to risk going into debt for the rest of their lives. Such a system might also prove to be unworkable. There could be recounts for candidates who received slightly less than 5% or 10% of the vote. Candidates

who didn't want to lose their subsidy or security deposit would demand recounts and tie up state and local election officials for weeks after an election.

3. Federal assistance could be made conditional on a candidate's ability to raise a certain amount of funds in small private contributions. These contributions would then be matched with federal grants.

This is perhaps the best way to eliminate frivolous candidates that has been proposed so far. However, this proposal would provide a huge incentive for the washing of funds. For example, a contributor of \$1,000 would increase his contribution by 100%, if he gave it under 20 different names at \$50 per name. This means of circumventing the law would make it easier for a candidate to qualify for federal assistance. This method might also raise far less money than is needed to wage an effective Senatorial or Presidential campaign, especially when it is coupled with stringent contribution limitations. It has also been described as "just another grant program," the incentives of which may stimulate candidates and causes which could not flourish on their own merits.

There are general problems with all of these approaches. Presently, some candidates run for office for the sole purpose of airing the issues and "educating" the public. All of the above proposals might eliminate or reduce candidates of this type. Also, the hassles and difficulties involved in applying for and receiving the federal funds might discourage some highly qualified candidates from running. In addition, any limitation on frivolous candidates may discriminate and deny equality of access to the political process. This would raise some serious questions about the constitutionality of such limitations. Furthermore, any type of weeding-out safeguards must be automatic and uniform to guarantee some semblance of fairness and equity, but this would probably involve a maze of rules and regulations, thereby discouraging participation in the political process.

EFFECT ON STATE AND LOCAL RACES

If a system of public financing is adopted, it is very likely that many states would continue with their systems of complete private financing. There are two possible serious consequences of a system of public financing. Such a system could dry up funds for state and local candidates, who already have a difficult time raising adequate funds. Private givers might feel that their responsibility has been satisfied by the National Program. Special interests would not. As a result, state and local candidates would be unable to raise sufficient funds. The general public would probably become less informed about these state and local candidates and the quality of state and local governments might decrease.

On the other hand, private contributors—especially special interest groups—might channel the funds formerly used in federal elections into state and local government. Expenditures in state and local races are presently much less than in national races, so if private funds were channeled toward the state and local sector, it might be easy to "buy" candidates with "dirty money." Furthermore, a dramatic increase in spending at the state and local level would probably mean a dramatic increase in overall spending in political campaigns, which is contrary to the goals of many of the proponents of public financing. Chasing "dirty money" from the nation's capitol to the state capitol and court house would be an ironic byproduct of federal financing.

EFFECTS ON CONTRIBUTIONS

Some public financing proposals would prohibit private contributions. It would probably be unconstitutional to deny people the long-enjoyed right to contribute to election campaigns. This would place a severe and unnecessary limitation on the right of

free speech and expression. In addition, it would be discriminatory, because it would let one person contribute his time, labor and expertise to a campaign, while denying another individual the right to participate in the only way he may be able to. For example, an accountant could donate thousands of dollars worth of his valuable time, while blue collar workers would be unable to make an equivalent contribution in money. Also, such a prohibition would reduce citizen participation in the political process. In his testimony before the Commerce Committee, Sen. McGovern heartily concurred with the following statement:

A citizen ought to have the privilege of making a contribution out of his pocket because of the feeling of involvement that he gets which is desirable and almost a necessity in our system of representative government.

The constitutional implications and political consequences of a prohibition on private contributions are too severe to seriously consider such a proposal.

Other public financing proposals set low contribution limitations. Unless strictly and stringently enforced, low limitations would only penalize the honest candidates. They would increase the incentives to circumvent the law. A person who contributes to several candidates and committees might violate these low restrictions unintentionally. On the other hand, intentional violations might be made to appear inadvertent. Even the most vigorous enforcement methods might be unable to uncover many of the resulting campaign abuses.

Still other public financing proposals either (1) set contribution limitations quite high, (2) do not cover primaries, or (3) do not cover certain types of candidates and parties. Under any of these conditions, candidates would still be susceptible to the influence of the special and vested interests, because these interests would still have considerable opportunities to channel large sums of money to some or all candidates.

Finally, some public financing proposals place reasonable limitations on contributions. Reasonable contribution limitations would probably be constitutional because they do not severely limit free speech.

However, these proposals raise the question of how to regulate the solicitation and use of private money obtained in addition to those funds received from the federal treasury. Under a system of public financing which permitted private contributions, there would have to be not just one, but two sets of complicated rules: one for funds obtained from the federal treasury and one for money obtained from private sources. Enforcement and compliance with two different sets of technical regulations might prove to be difficult and impractical for the candidates and the enforcement agency alike.

Some proponents of public financing have suggested as an alternative that all candidates be allowed to choose between a public financing route and a private financing route. This, however, would combine the worst of both systems. Even if it didn't, those candidates who take the private route might charge those who take the public route with having their hand in the till. Those candidates who go the public route might charge those who go the private route with going to the "fat cats" and being the lackeys of the special and vested interests. Meanwhile, the important campaign issues will be ignored to a greater extent than they are already. Furthermore, candidates who chose the private route might find that few people were willing to contribute, because the public's attitude might be, "You could have gotten your money from the federal treasury, why come to us for a hand-out?"

Any system of public financing that does not completely prohibit private contributions must have provisions for dealing with COPE, AmPAC, BiPAC and other similar organizations. If they are prohibited from contribut-

ing, the courts might declare such a ban as being an unconstitutional limitation on first amendment rights. If they are allowed to contribute, the special and vested interests may use these organizations as conduits to channel huge sums of money into campaigns. If there are strict limitations on contributions by these groups and political action committees, it may discriminate against some broad-based special interest groups.

EFFECTS ON EXPENDITURES

In the area of campaign expenditures many of the proponents of public financing make several assertions: (1) public financing will curb the costs of political campaigns; (2) it is desirable to curb the cost of campaigns, because spending is presently too high; (3) a reduction in the amount of campaign expenditures will improve the quality of the political process; and (4) overall expenditure limitations under a system of public financing are workable and enforceable. All of these assertions are subject to challenge.

(1) Many proponents of public financing cite the alarming and spiraling cost of campaigning as one of the reasons for the need for public financing. Yet, some of their plans for public financing might actually increase spending. For example, federal subsidies for the House of Representatives would cover all congressional districts, even though over 80% of them are relatively uncontested. In fact, the candidates in the uncontested districts, where spending is presently negligible, would receive a total of four times as much federal funds as those candidates in the 20% of the districts that are contested. If primaries are included and limits are set at \$100,000 or 20¢ per eligible voter, the costs could run to \$160 million for House races alone, perhaps totaling \$300 million for all federal elections in a presidential election year. Even with the limits set at this level (higher than in most public financing proposals), it would be almost impossible to beat an incumbent in a House race.

(2) Admittedly, most public financing plans set the limits at somewhat lower level. This is in accordance with the belief that campaign expenditures are too high. However, this idea needs to be challenged. The price of public financing schemes runs as low as \$93 million. This figure is mere peanuts. The advertising budget for Procter and Gamble in 1972 was twice this figure. Total spending for all political campaigns was \$400 million in 1972, while the advertising budget for all U.S. companies totaled \$22.5 billion. Is this a rational allocation of national priorities? Should the cost of the debate on which type of soap suds or car to buy exceed by fifty times the cost of the debate on the important political issues of our time? Furthermore, the costs of campaigning in the United States are actually lower than that in many other countries. An index of political expenditures per voter for various countries showed a range of 27¢ for Australia to \$21.20 for Israel. The United States, at \$1.12, is clustered near India and Japan at the lower range of the index.

(3) In defense of public financing and strict expenditure limitations, supporters say that these steps will improve the political process. They say that many individuals of quality and independence are unable to raise enough money to run a respectable campaign, and are automatically defeated or discouraged from trying.

Some of these proponents' proposals would cut expenses in federal elections in half. While the amount of expenditures in a campaign is not the only variable affecting public interest, public debate on the issue, and the number of people who vote, a reduction in expenditures of this magnitude would lead to a reduction in political advertising and campaigning which might very well reduce citizen interest and participation, as well as reduce the likelihood of public debate on the issues. Such stringent limitations might also

actually increase the probability that "individuals of quality and independence" will be "automatically defeated or discouraged from trying." Herbert Alexander in his testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee stated:

One of the key goals of the political system should be a more highly competitive system, because it helps to make the system more responsive. Limitations tend to reduce opportunities for voters to learn something about candidates, but even more significantly, ceilings reduce the opportunities for voters to learn something about politics . . . Electioneering helps to structure and politicize society, and this is periodically essential to the smooth functioning of a democracy.

Liberal columnist Tom Wicker has stated: Considering that every poll shows how little Americans really know about great issues and how few know anything about even the leading politicians—considering also the dismayed record of lost bond issues and defeated propositions, the immense social investments many believe needed, the remaining number of uncontested Congressional districts and one-party states, and the shamefully low percentage of Americans who bother to vote even in Presidential races, it can well be argued that we need to spend more, not less, on politics and the political education it entails.

It is true that incumbents are generally able to raise more money than their opponents. In the Senate in 1972, incumbents outspent their challengers by an average of two to one. On the other hand, especially in the House of Representatives, incumbents are usually beaten only by challengers who can spend huge sums of money. Most of the proposals for public financing would limit House candidates to \$60,000 to \$100,000. However, in many instances, a challenger will need around \$150,000 to beat an incumbent. Yet, if this were the limit for federal campaigns, the total cost for House campaigns could easily run to \$250 million for each election. A \$150,000 limitation for a Congressional campaign may sound huge to reformers or to incumbents whose re-election does not require spending of amounts anywhere near this figure. However, for the challenger, lower limitations impose nearly impossible problems. With today's costs there is no way a challenger can make himself known over a well-identified incumbent when there are stringent expenditure limitations.

An interesting study by W. F. Lott and P. D. Warner III of the Economics Department of the University of Connecticut written in 1971 is reproduced in the Congressional Record of September 23, 1971 on pages 33137 to 33140. Lott and Warner say bluntly that the impact of spending restrictions is "to insulate the incumbent and for all practical purposes insure his election."

Warner-Lott's research "indicates, for example, that an office-holder who has 40% of the total eligible votes in his district registered in his party, can, if he and his opponent are limited to \$50,000, expect to receive 60% of the total votes cast."

Table 4 shows that with a 50%-50% party registration, the challenger must spend over \$54,000 and the incumbent only \$5,000 to have an equal chance of election.

TABLE 4.—MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD POINT ESTIMATE OF CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURE NECESSARY TO GIVE CANDIDATE AN EQUAL A PRIORI CHANCE OF ELECTION

Vote registration in the party of the candidate as a percentage of total registration	Expenditures	
	Incumbent	Challenger
30	\$31,335.59	\$343,960.69
40	11,091.46	121,747.36
50	4,955.96	54,399.96
60	2,566.08	28,167.05
70	1,470.89	16,145.54

One way to balance the scales under a system of public financing does exist. A candidate would receive more money if he was a challenger than he would if he were an incumbent. In order for this alternative to be effective, a measure of the value of incumbency would have to be calculated and the difference paid to the challenger. This system, however, stands little or no chance of passage because Congressmen would not want to see their challengers in a position of beating them at election time.

Another myth held by some proponents is that public financing will aid the common man and the poor man. However, public financing with low expenditure limitations would fail to do anything about the problem of the man who brings not money but other resources to the election. The celebrity, the sports figure, the movie star and other famous individuals will have had their advertising done for them as a result of their occupation. They don't need to spend money on their political campaign. Financial restrictions and limitations imposed on their opponents may simply insure an unequal contest and deny the common man a chance to serve in Congress.

(4) Under the low overall limitations of some of the public financing proposals, there would be greater incentives than at present to circumvent the law, and it would be much harder to monitor, audit and oversee campaign expenditures. What criterion would be used to determine which candidate an expenditure will be credited to? How will election day expenses be prorated? For example, a gubernatorial candidate, who is not subject to federal expenditure limitations, could rent a fleet of cars for his supporters who would also indirectly, if not intentionally, be assisting candidates for federal office. Would these expenditures be prorated for the federal candidates, even if they were not authorized? Also, state and local officials or individual citizens might spend money for a candidate for federal office without his authorization. Would this be included in overall expenditures? If activity such as this is permitted, a huge loophole would exist. If it is prohibited, the law may be unconstitutional. There are other problems with limitations under present public financing proposals. What happens if a candidate exceeds his limitations and runs into debt? Is the federal government obligated to pay for these debts? Such an offense could be either inadvertent or intentional. How would a candidate's motives be determined?

The stringent, sweeping overall expenditure limitations that some public financing schemes would impose may also invite violations of the law because such violations might be extremely difficult to document or prove. It gets progressively harder to keep track of what a candidate or his supporters are spending on such easily manufactured items as bumper stickers or other printed materials.

PUBLIC CONFIDENCE

Perhaps the major argument used in support of public financing is that it will result in clean, open and honest elections, thereby increasing public confidence in a system that is presently beset by a crisis of confidence. But public financing will not increase public confidence if:

It fails to curb the excessive power of the special and vested interests;

It makes the political parties, presently the political entities with the most broadly based popular support, less responsive to the people;

It opens the way for federal control of political parties and candidates;

The law becomes unenforceable because of unreasonable limitations;

It becomes an Incumbent Guaranteed Re-Election Act in which challengers have little or no chance of winning;

The beleaguered taxpayer sees his hard-earned money supporting candidates in whom he has no positive interest or to whom he may object most strenuously;

The taxpayer sees his money supporting mindless sloganeering and superfluous rhetoric that goes on in some campaigns.

It sends treasury checks to ego-trippers just running for office as an exciting pastime, without much thought of winning or serving;

All campaigns are subsidized equally when many races are relatively uncontested;

The cost of such a program runs to \$200 or \$300 million?

Even if most of the above horrors do not happen, the occurrence of only a few of them might greatly discredit public financing. Another unworkable, unenforceable, and unconscionably extravagant system might only deal a permanently crippling blow to public confidence in the American political process.

CONCLUSION

The arguments in favor of public financing are not without merit. However, the idea has not received adequate study and the arguments in its favor are not as strong as is commonly thought. Certainly, a proposal that could entail such dramatic changes in the political process might have many unforeseeable consequences, and has such powerful arguments both for and against should warrant a most careful examination and evaluation. Furthermore, proponents of public financing should not forget that the same goals can be achieved by writing responsible rules into a system of private financing. Intensive study of both public financing and alternative means of private financing is needed before we decide which means is best suitable for achieving the goal of open, honest and clean elections.

DON'T PANIC—AMERICA CAN SURVIVE THIS ENERGY CRUNCH

HON. JOHN B. CONLAN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. CONLAN. Mr. Speaker, now that the full impact of our energy crunch is becoming a painful reality, many people understandably wonder why we have been caught with fuel shortages that threaten our standard of living.

The most frequent question during my Thanksgiving visit with Arizonans was why industry and Government in the world's most consumer-oriented nation had failed to head off impending shortages with increased supplies to satisfy rising consumer demand.

After all, we have not come close to running out of fuel in the physical sense. There is plenty of tolerably clean fuel still available in the world. Thus far, it looks like the energy crisis is a self-inflicted wound—that Uncle Sam's shortsightedness is to blame, not Mother Nature.

Frankly speaking, this energy crisis that has caused some talk in terms of possible wholesale fuel rationing and other unwise Government measures that fail to get at the root issue of increasing fuel supplies, was caused by Government mismanagement in the first place.

Government officials were glad to oblige oil companies that several decades ago asked for special privileges, such as

oil import quotas, price fixing, and oil prorationing. This gave the bureaucracy a chance to regulate and control yet another area of our economy.

But it was this sort of imprudent Government meddling in the development and marketing of fuel that initially threw our energy industry out of joint and allowed consumption to outstrip both current production and expansion of capacity.

The natural gas industry—first to be hit really hard by supply problems last year—is a classic case in point. Through most of the 1960's, the Federal Power Commission held a tight rein on the price of gas at the wellhead—so tight that producers found it unprofitable and gradually stopped exploring for new gas.

They picked up their rigs and went abroad, where the chance of making a profit in that very risky business was better than it was at home. The number of new wells drilled dropped year by year, and by 1968 the United States was using more gas each year than was being discovered. The problem of shortages, then, resulted less from inadequate resources than from ill-conceived regulation.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has, likewise, missed the boat by failing before now to encourage development of so-called exotic energy sources—atomic fusion, solar energy, coal gasification and liquefaction, geothermal energy, tidal and wind power, and magnetohydrodynamics.

Until the new House Energy Subcommittee, of which I am a member, was organized this year, none of the six or so committees and subcommittees concerned with energy had constructively set out toward a long-term program to develop these new energy sources to carry us forward in the event of fossil fuel shortages or depletion.

Even though our Energy Subcommittee is now moving full steam ahead to pursue solar energy and the other exotics, because this was not started a decade ago, we have been caught without alternative energy sources during the immediate fuel shortage problem.

This has been aggravated by the Mid-east oil cutoff and the fact that oil from Alaska is still 4 years away. As a result, we are in for some discomfort and belt-tightening for the next several years.

My urgent hope is that the American people persevere as they always have—that they remain calm and do not panic because of the current energy squeeze. Sloganeers and big government advocates will call for unwise Government measures such as fuel rationing and so forth to see us through this crisis. But we must avoid allowing ourselves to be buffeted by further attempts at bureaucratization.

This energy crunch will be relieved by restoring the time-tested free market demand and supply balance, thus allowing fair competitive forces to establish realistic prices for natural gas at the wellhead and gasoline at the pump. It will not be permanently relieved by more Government edicts and regulations.

We must also remember our own contribution as consumers to the critical demand for energy. While we work to-

ward long-range solutions on a national level, as we now are in the Congress, we must also eliminate squandering of energy resources through inefficiency and extravagance.

We must expect of industry an increased efficiency in such areas as energy conversion, automotive design, and airline management.

We must expect of ourselves moderation in such areas as heating and air-conditioning our homes and buildings, and driving our cars and other motor vehicles.

Individual prudence in the use of energy at home, at work, and at play can make a great contribution in moderating the energy demand curve.

We all have ample reason to trust the ability of American commonsense and technology to solve the long-term energy crisis. We must each trust the other to exercise that restraint necessary to ease the burden of the short-term energy crunch.

POST EDITORIAL CORRECTS PRESIDENT'S SCAPEGOATING

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, few would debate that the Nation faces a legitimate energy crisis, most certainly now and probably for several years to come.

It is a time when the few paths of action available to us, as a nation, must not be made more difficult by useless posturing, the spreading of misinformation, and just plain scapegoating.

Yet this realization seems to have escaped the President. In his haste to transfer blame for our current energy dilemma to everyone but himself, he has claimed, on nationwide television, that the Congress has refused to send him needed legislation, which if passed and signed, would provide some sort of mysterious relief from the Arab oil cutback and our own monumental wastefulness.

The Washington Post, on Sunday November 25, correctly editorialized that most of the bills the President alluded to were by no means crucial and even if passed could do little to alleviate our present problems.

I include the Post editorial in the Record at this time for the information of those who might be gulled by the President's claims:

THE PRESIDENT, CONGRESS AND ENERGY

To get through the coming year without excessive economic damage, the country is going to need new energy legislation of great range and strength. It is legislation that will sharply affect all of us, and public attitudes toward the rules will be crucial. That kind of legislation requires close and continuous cooperation between the White House and Congress. Since these statements are obvious to the point of being truisms, Mr. Nixon's current aggressive hostility toward Congress becomes all the more mystifying. He is now pursuing a vehement campaign to blame as much as possible of the energy shortages on Congress and its Democratic leaders, while

simultaneously asking them for more help. His appearance before the Associated Press managing editors a week ago was a particularly egregious example.

He sent Congress a message last April, he said. And what happened? "I asked them for seven pieces of legislation to deal with energy. One has reached my desk, the Alaska pipeline. I signed it. The other six, I hope they act before they go home for Christmas . . . The President warned in April, the Congress did not act and now, it is time for the Congress to get away from some of these other diversions if they have time and get on to this energy crisis." This accusation suggests Mr. Nixon is not fully briefed on his own program.

One of those six pending bills of which he spoke would provide compensation for the companies that held the canceled drilling leases in the Santa Barbara Channel. It is not an energy bill at all, but rather a compensation bill. And where is it now? The administration withdrew it, four days before Mr. Nixon's appearance before the managing editors.

Another of the six April proposals was a tax credit to encourage exploratory oil drilling. But rising oil prices over the last six months have set off a tremendous exploration boom that is currently limited only by the severe shortages in drilling equipment and casing pipe. Whatever the circumstances of last April, further tax credits are hardly required now. Still another of the April proposals was to develop deep water ports to unload huge tankers bringing us crude oil from, mainly, the Arab countries. Current developments in the Mideast seem to have diminished the urgency of the superport bill. Mr. Nixon has quite rightly proclaimed independence in fuel supply to be a national goal. But if we are building toward independence of supply, do we also need superports for Arabian oil? It does not appear that anyone in the administration has seriously addressed the question. Mr. Nixon was merely scoring a polemical point reflexively and recklessly.

One of the April proposals would have simplified site selection and approval for electric generating plants. Another would have set new standards for strip miners. Both are moving slowly because they raise difficult issues of environmental protection, conservation and safety. Neither of them offers any very sudden relief of the shortages.

Of all seven of Mr. Nixon's April proposals, there was only one—the bill to deregulate natural gas—that would have helped the country this winter. It might have helped quite a lot. But it is stalemated for reasons that illustrate the central defect in the administration's whole approach to energy legislation.

The case for deregulating gas gets stronger as the price of oil rises. Of the three basic fuels—coal, oil and gas—only one is regulated. The wider the gap between the low price of gas and the high prices of competing fuels, the more the gas shortage is aggravated. But the issue of deregulation is a familiar one, and it is perfectly clear that Congress will not act until it has a bill that adequately responds to the legitimate and well-founded fears of consumers.

Any successful bill will have to contain guarantees that gas rates will not continue to favor industry by loading the whole rise on householders. It will also have to assure consumers that the continental pipelines cannot be used to destroy competition among producers. Several congressional committees are working on legislation that can answer those doubts. But they are not getting much help from the administration, which tends to view amendments as evidence of insubordination.

The most valuable energy legislation enacted this year has been the oil allocation authority, which was neither sought nor,

until last week, even supported by the Nixon administration. It was originally put forward by Sen. Thomas F. Eagleton (D-Mo.) and tacked as an amendment onto the wage and price control bill last April. The administration disliked the idea at the time, but that legislation enabled them to begin fuel oil allocation last month.

Last week the Senate passed a bill to authorize gasoline rationing. President Nixon first asked for this authorization on Nov. 7. The bill that the Senate passed was introduced by Sen. Henry Jackson (D-Wash.) on Oct. 18. We are seeing, in fact, an extraordinary demonstration of congressional initiative.

Mr. Nixon's April message had, in general, one pervasive defect that explains the meager response. It is a matter of balance. All of his proposals benefited the oil and coal companies, heavily and obviously. Some of them clearly benefited the public as well. But the circumstance that they all came down in favor of the same set of interests gave the message a disarming lopsidedness. If citizens are going to have to pay much higher prices and tolerate lower environmental standards, they would like to see some sign that the companies are going to have to give a little too. There was no hint of it in Mr. Nixon's April address, and not much in any of the subsequent addresses. That, at bottom, is why his proposals do not get rapid action in the midst of shortages that even he now acknowledges do constitute a crisis.

IOWA GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE

HON. WILEY MAYNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege yesterday, on November 29, to address the Iowa Governor's Conference on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals at Des Moines. This significant 3-day meeting was called by Governor Robert D. Ray of Iowa, and was organized by Dean John D. Scarlett of Drake University Law School, chairman of the Iowa Crime Commission, and the commission's executive director George W. Orr. My remarks to this highly successful and well attended conference follow:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN WILEY MAYNE

I am delighted to meet this afternoon with this distinguished group of public officials and citizens from throughout Iowa who are generously contributing your time and ability to the Iowa Governor's Conference on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. From over 500 standards and goals recommended in the five volume task force reports of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice, Chairman John Scarlett and Director George Orr have selected 115 standards and goals which identify the most realistic problems and most attainable objectives for our particular State. Iowans should indeed be proud that ours is one of the first States to react to the reports of the National Advisory Commission and to test the proposed standards and goals against real conditions here at home. You have been considering the applicability of these standards in your respective workshops this week. You have determined whether Iowa already meets or exceeds a particular standard, whether it should be adopted, modified, or rejected, what legislation or administrative action may be required to implement the standard, how much it will cost and what

target date should be established and whether it will really work. Some of the selected standards and goals have no doubt proved to be highly controversial, but I am advised by the organizers of the Conference this morning that it has exceeded all expectations.

Your determinations as to what standards and goals are feasible for Iowa will be of great assistance in the long-range planning of the Iowa Crime Commission. They should provide the basis for legislation and for private and public action to improve State and local criminal justice.

We must all recognize that serious abuses and weaknesses continue to undermine the criminal justice system of this nation. This is also true to a more limited extent in Iowa. Some of the deficiencies which concern us are overcrowded and inadequate court facilities, the urgent need for additional judges, delays encountered in prosecution of both criminal and civil actions, the lack of initiative on the part of some judges to expedite actions and clear dockets, too liberal policies of granting postponements of trial dates, and the overwhelming burdens imposed by an ever-increasing volume of cases. Prisons too often fail to rehabilitate, police forces are underpaid and undertrained, and case loads are unevenly distributed among trial judges. Shocking discrepancies occur in penalties imposed for various offenses. In 1971, nationwide, 71% of those convicted of auto theft went to jail for an average 3 years whereas only 22% of those convicted for embezzlement received any jail sentence, and then averaging only 1.7 years. Of course embezzlers are generally more educated and well to do than car thieves. Defendants convicted of federal income tax evasion in one federal district invariably serve time while those in an adjoining district never do.

I recognize in this room today many persons who have long sought needed reforms in our system of justice here in Iowa including some with whom I worked for adoption of the Iowa Plan for selection of judges in the early 60's. You have been especially active in improving standards of criminal justice, seeking to raise the level of integrity and ability in the law enforcement profession as a whole, sheriffs, police, prosecutors and judges alike. Chief Justice Warren E. Burger this week put his finger on one of the problems, when he criticized the fact that, in his estimation, over half of the nation's lawyers appearing in court rooms, whether in criminal or civil cases, are inadequately trained to try the cases. He called for a major restructuring of both American law practice and legal education in order to stress training in trial advocacy, as an essential ingredient to improving our justice system.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the Department of Justice has been trying to mobilize all State and local elements from all disciplines in the criminal justice field in the war on crime. It seeks the views of police, courts, corrections and other law enforcement professionals as to how an interrelated and coordinated program can best be fashioned at state and local levels. The goal is to strengthen the capability of all criminal justice agencies and protect the public by significantly reducing crime. The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals came into being in 1971. Although financed and provided with technical staff support by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the Commission's work and reports are primarily the product of State and local law enforcement professionals. They were drafted by people with long experience in law enforcement including, for example, my own sheriff "Whitey" Rosenberger of Woodbury County and Police Chief William Hansen from my home town of Sioux City who served on the Juvenile Delinquency Advisory Task Force.

The Commission has produced six volumes, a summary report entitled "A National Strategy to Reduce Crime", and five wide-ranging reports on police, courts, corrections, the criminal justice system, and community crime prevention programs. They represent a major effort to bring together material providing information about the vital services needed to maintain a lawful society, and are designed to have the maximum possible impact on the reduction of crime.

You have probably found from your panel discussions that some of these standards and goals have little relevance to conditions in Iowa. However, they do provide a yardstick with which Iowans can plan and measure their respective criminal justice objectives and progress, and compare their state and local governments' relative performance with that of others.

The National Advisory Commission served with the understanding that its standards and goals were only to be advisory, not mandatory for any State or local government, and I for one as a member of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice would strongly oppose any federal effort to force any jurisdiction to comply with each and every one of these standards and goals.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has assured me that it will not attempt to impose these standards and goals upon the States and local governmental agencies. However, it is making every effort to bring the informational material in these reports and the recommendations made to the attention of each State, in the hope that the States and their constituent jurisdictions will find in them proposals tailored to their respective needs and proposals that will stimulate discussion leading to the adoption of solutions appropriate to the particular State and local governments. To this end, L.E.A.A. has established a planning and management office, which is developing an agency-wide plan to utilize the work of the Standards and Goals Commission. The agency is developing plans to test the Standards and Goals Commission's major recommendations in the courts, including the recommendations that felony cases be brought to trial within 60 days of arrest, and that present appeals processes be replaced by a single, unified review proceeding. Administrator Santarelli does plan to require States applying for direct L.E.A.A. special corrections grants to demonstrate that they have given satisfactory emphasis to community-based correctional facilities and programs, including diagnostic service, halfway houses, probation and other supervisory release programs for the pre- and post-adjudication referral of delinquents, youthful offenders and Community-oriented programs for supervising parolees.

Director Santarelli tells me he will attempt to influence States and local jurisdictions to comply with the pertinent Standards and Goals recommended by the Commission in order to qualify for special purpose grants allotted in the Director's discretion. But while he will attempt to encourage States, and local police agencies, to study and adopt those Standards and Goals which they may deem fit, he assures me he will in no way require any incorporation of the Commission's Standards and Goals into a State Plan as a condition for its approval.

I commend such restraint, which is rarely found in a bureaucracy at any level. The L.E.A.A. block grant program was a forerunner of both general revenue sharing and of the current proposals for special revenue sharing programs, very important concepts of New Federalism in the attempt to bring back authority and responsibility to the States and local governments and to lessen control from Washington, D.C. It is important that the philosophy of this im-

portant program not be tampered with. This Congressman will continue to do everything he can to make sure that Iowa's criminal justice officials are not made errand boys for federal bureaucrats. Each State must remain free to determine its own criminal justice course of action under the Constitution.

The Commission's report can do much to direct our incentives and goals for law enforcement, serving as a catalyst for State and local talents to dovetail efforts toward policy-making mechanisms in the areas of criminal justice.

But what works in the ghettos of New York City will not necessarily work in Iowa. Our policy-making here in Iowa must be tailored to our own measurements, and be sensitive to the needs of our own citizens and law enforcement officials. L.E.A.A. funds and advice can be helpful, but the decisions you yourself make on your own home ground will be most important. I strongly recommend that in the standards and goals you adopt here you retain flexibility and room for change, for circumstances and needs do change and the society around us casts a different shadow every day. You are still confronted with an enormous challenge, but for the first time in many years reliable statistical information indicates substantial progress is being made on a national level.

For the first time since 1955, crime actually declined in 1972 with a 3 percent decrease in overall crime. The first six months of 1973 have shown a further drop of an additional 6 percent in overall crime.

However, optimistic statistics are of little consolation to the millions of citizens and law enforcement officers who continue to be victims of crime. The total cost of crime is still estimated at more than \$51 billion yearly, with organized crime accounting for over a third of this figure.

This month, a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee reported the Public Safety Officers Survivor's Benefits Act, of which I am pleased to be a cosponsor. This legislation, which I am hopeful the House will enact early next year, would amend the Law Enforcement Assistance Act to provide \$50,000 benefits to the surviving spouse of any law enforcement officer, federal, state or local, who died as the result of injuries sustained while engaged in preventing a crime or apprehending or guarding a suspect (or of a fireman who dies from injuries sustained while fighting a fire). Enactment of this legislation will provide incentive for public safety officers to remain in their professions despite the hazards, knowing that their families will have security in the event they suffer mortal injury. This should assist State and local law enforcement agencies in keeping qualified men on a career basis.

In my estimation, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has more than proved its worth. It has made mistakes, to be sure, but it has learned from them and the administration of the agency has vastly improved. While it and the State planning agencies and local crime commissions have received criticism from time to time, subsequent investigations have in general established that the criticisms had little basis or justification, or were greatly exaggerated. Where errors have been made they have quickly been corrected and seldom repeated. As a member of the House Judiciary Committee which maintains close oversight over the L.E.A.A., I am pleased to take this opportunity to commend it, the Iowa Crime Commission and the various local crime commissions in Iowa for their diligent and conscientious efforts to carry forth their programs to improve our criminal justice system, and to wish them continued success.

I would like to close by discussing what is to me the most distressing section of the National Advisory Commission's report made public just this week.

The Commission found that corruption of public officials "stands as a serious impediment to the task of reducing criminality in America", and that widespread public belief in "the existence of corruption breeds further crime by providing for the citizen a model of official lawlessness that undermines any acceptable rule of law."

While three-fourths of the report deals with citizen action, drug abuse treatment, and education, the most dramatic language in it for me appears in a section called "Integrity in Government."

"As long as official corruption exists," it says, "the war against crime will be perceived by many as a war of the powerful against the powerless; 'law and order' will be an empty phrase."

The Commission concluded that public corruption contributes to criminality by providing an excuse and rationalization for its existence among those who commit crime, and that official corruption breeds disrespect for the law.

The Commission recommended that States require public officials to disclose annually all their assets, sources of income, debts and debtors, partners and associates, and clients if the official continues to practice law. Among other recommendations, it urges each State to enact campaign disclosure regulations at least as stringent as the 1971 Act governing federal elections, and that has already been substantially accomplished by the last session of the legislature here in Iowa.

The crisis of confidence in our elected and appointed leaders is apparent at every level of government, and applies to every branch of the government in the public mind. At the federal level, the 1971 Federal Elections Act may help, but I submit it is not enough. I have therefore introduced a Clean Elections Act which will require much more complete financial disclosure and limit campaign contributions. The House Administration Committee has held hearings on this legislation but still has not reported it for House consideration. I remain hopeful that it or some version of campaign contribution reform legislation may soon be enacted.

Requiring complete financial disclosure, not only by Members and candidates for Congress, but also by top executive officials and all members of the federal judiciary, should help restore public confidence in our institutions. I have introduced legislation which would require each Member of Congress to file a copy of his annual federal income tax return for public inspection within 30 days after he files it with the I.R.S. in each of the last four Congresses. Although I have repeatedly asked the Committee on Standards and Conduct to expedite action, the committee majority has not seen fit even to hold hearings on the bill.

I pledge to you that I will continue to press for such legislation and invite your active participation in the effort to restore confidence and faith in all of our institutions, not just the criminal justice system to which this conference has been principally devoted.

MAKING NOBODY HAPPY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, with Government credibility at a historic low, it is preposterous to plunge the Government into a task at which it cannot succeed—to wit, gasoline rationing. Allocators' arbitrary decisions will prompt arbitrary

mistakes in allocation—mistakes over which the average citizen has no control, but which will engender in each citizen increased disgust with Government's efforts to do that which, by its nature, it cannot.

Today's Wall Street Journal addresses the issue of gasoline rationing with extraordinary clarity and insight. I urgently recommend it to my colleagues who are anxious to "do something now." As the editorial points out, with distrust of Government at such a high point, further Government failures can only pose increased strain on the fragile fabric of our "social contract" which binds this Nation together.

The article follows:

MAKING NOBODY HAPPY

By some immutable law of politics, the nation seems to be moving towards gasoline rationing, even though the President has publicly declared that he hates the idea and even though his objections have attracted substantial support from economists and experienced bureaucrats.

But before rationing advocates push the administration into such a measure they might consider how rationing will pose political as well as economic difficulties. That already is becoming evident in the reaction to fuel oil allocations.

Airline executives, for example, are vocally unhappy over the 15% fuel cut they will have to take in January. They think the airlines are being asked to bear an exceptionally heavy part of the burden of conserving fuel. Public surface transportation, fuel production industries and a good many other users have been given a higher ranking. The airlines argue that they are the basic means of intercity travel and that most of their passengers are on business trips, yet they are being treated as a relatively non-essential service and forced into employee layoffs and other hardships.

Allocators have to make their decisions, of course. Presumably they decided it is more important for the people who ride transit systems to get to their jobs than for people who ride airplanes to get to where they are going. The theory, we suppose, is that folks who ride airplanes often are business types who might be able to handle what they do by mail or phone. On the other hand, conceivably what the airplane riders do is in fact more important to keeping the overall economy going than are the jobs of a good many folks who ride subways and buses.

The point is that in any kind of arbitrary allocation system some people are going to feel justifiably unhappy. More seriously, they are likely to feel that the government has treated them unfairly, in fact discriminated against them. A social contract with the government has been abridged by the government, such a victim tells himself, in effect. So why should he be a nice guy? If this sort of thing happens on a large enough scale, the effect is social and political unrest and demoralization. What started out as a spirit of cooperation in the face of a common need turns sour.

At any given point in history it is not easy to measure the binding power of the social contract between the government and the nation's citizens. But there should be no doubt that such a binding power is vital to the preservation of an orderly society, one in which citizens willingly obey the law and respond to the government's calls for support and cooperation. It should be now be obvious that this nation's social contract underwent serious stresses during the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. It is under strain again from the Watergate revelations.

We suspect that there will be more complaints forthcoming as the impact of the

fuel allocation system sinks in, assuming that it is necessary to maintain it through the winter. Anyone who has ever had an argument with a department store computer can imagine what some homeowners will inevitably face in the allocation of fuel oil. Already, New York area householders with 275 gallons oil tanks are complaining they are at a disadvantage to owners of 1,000 gallon tanks, since proposed rules allow everyone to start with a full tank on Jan. 1. Similarly, the hardships of gasoline rationing will be spread in ways that are uneven and inevitably unfair.

Under rationing, the government volunteers to take the blame for every mistake and misallocation in a system that is inherently arbitrary. Even more important to national morale, the decisions of this system, unlike those of a free market, are completely beyond the control of the average citizen.

We raise these questions for the benefit of those who would plunge blithely into gasoline rationing on top of the fuel oil allocation system. The potential for demoralization would be greatly expanded, not to mention the cost of administration which taxpayers would have to bear.

If the market is allowed to make allocations there is far less likelihood of tensions between citizens and government and no question of abridging the social contract. We previously have cited here some of the other advantages. If market demands means higher prices that in turn stimulates new investment and research to expand production of the scarce commodity. The arbitrary decisions of an allocation bureaucracy only act as a dead hand on progress—not because bureaucrats are somehow evil but because no small group of men can make the decisions made every day by a vast and sensitive market system.

In trying to supplant the free market, the politicians are volunteering for a task at which they cannot succeed. It allows them the image of "doing something" now, but it will not be long before their inevitable failures present them with even more difficult problems, and increase the feelings of impotence, frustration and failed expectation that already pose so severe a strain on this society.

SOME WASTEFUL PATTERNS IN AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS

HON. DALE MILFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, you and the Members of this body are probably very much aware of the effect the fuel shortage is having on the aviation industry.

Drastic cuts in aviation fuel allocations are taking their toll, not only on the aviation industry, but on our economy. Hardly an edition of the newspaper comes out without another report of layoffs in the aviation field—pilots and ground support personnel in the airlines; skilled workers in the aviation construction industry.

There are steps being taken to see that aviation as an industry escapes discrimination. But none of these steps addresses itself to aviation fuel conservation.

I have written the Federal Aviation Administrator suggesting some steps which will move toward conservation of aviation fuel, and I would like to have

this letter appear in the RECORD, and I invite comments from my colleagues:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 30, 1973.
Mr. ALEXANDER P. BUTTERFIELD,
Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ALEX: I am receiving a stack of mail each day on the cut-back of fuel for general aviation. You probably have also received considerable mail on the subject.

Due to my past work in the aviation industry, I seem to have inherited a large number of constituents that do not even live in my state—much less in my District. In any case, they have been camping on my doorstep and they need help.

I am sure that you will agree that we do have a serious shortage and that conservation is our only immediate answer.

A few of us in the House are taking steps to see that the Emergency Energy Bill is properly worded so as not to discriminate against general aviation. This will be fine in so far as allocation is concerned, but will do nothing in the way of conservation.

In my mail, there is a noticeable number of complaints from corporate operations, air taxi operators, airline pilots, and private pilots concerning: (1) excessive holding pattern times; (2) take-off holding times; and (3) gate-starts followed by long taxi distances. All of these are live engine operations that expend fuel without moving passengers from one destination to another with any degree of efficiency.

While I am probably one of the most enthusiastic boosters of aviation in the Congress, I must also be responsible and fair to all other energy-using Americans. I can not, and shall not, defend aviation unless we are also doing our best to conserve fuel along with the rest of the Nation.

In all honesty, these complaints appear to have merit.

I am aware that your Agency, throughout its lifetime, has been fighting a "catch up" battle. The aviation industry, that you serve, has been growing faster than your service could ideally accommodate. Furthermore, in the past we have always addressed ourselves to air travel in terms of speed, convenience, emergency needs, sport flying, and rapid transit to cities without commercial airline service—as opposed to strict dollar-per-mile travel cost.

Perhaps we now need to re-evaluate our past thinking and habits. We have a new factor to contend with—a fuel shortage. Furthermore, I am convinced that we can feasibly do some belt-tightening without seriously harming the normal missions of general and commercial aviation—other than some inconvenience.

First, let's take a look at the "gate start". It will be inconvenient for commercial airlines to tow loaded aircraft to the run-up positions before starting engines. It will also cost them extra money. However, the profit position of commercial airlines has changed substantially during the past few weeks. Many "money loss" routes have been dropped. Load factors are now near maximum. In short, the airline company can afford to absorb the additional cost of towing to run-up position before starting. There would be very little inconvenience to the passenger because taxi speed is only very slightly greater than towing speed.

Second, let's take a look at excessive holding pattern times. For the past several years, your agency has asked the Congress for funds to install a computerized system in air traffic control to handle instrument flight plans. Although not always to the extent that your Agency would request, the Congress has appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars to install computerized and automated air traffic control systems. It is my understanding

that FAA now has computer capacity to handle all instrument operations in areas where major congestion might occur.

This being the case, FAA should be able to pre-plan and coordinate arrival times of all instrument flight plan traffic in such a way as to avoid extended holding pattern delays. I make this statement with the assumption that "instrument traffic" would have a priority over "Visual Flight Rule (VFR)" traffic, and also that the operator might experience some inconvenient delays before take-off. If FAA does not have the authority to give instrument traffic priority over VFR traffic, then perhaps this is a matter that should be brought to the attention of the Congress for possible new legislation.

Third, computerized planning would hold the aircraft on the ground, at the ramp or gate positions before engine-start, for his take-off clearance. Again, this might produce some temporary "inconvenience," but would result in a considerable savings of fuel.

The collective fuel savings, industry-wide, would allow general and commercial aviation operations to proceed at a reduced rate (with some inconvenience), whereas, the entire aviation industry might be drastically damaged by the alternative.

Will you please give consideration to these points and share your comments with me, which I will share with other Members of the House of Representatives. If your Agency needs assistance in the form of new legislation, I am sure that my colleagues and I would be very interested in looking into the matter with you.

Sincerely,

DALE MILFORD,
Member of Congress.

THE IMPACT

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the current energy crisis has supplied our news media with a strong and controversial topic of discussion which should long outlast the winter heating season.

Already, I have seen and heard a number of good news specials on the fuel shortage produced by the electronic media, and as many by the masters of print. Among them is a piece penned by Mr. George Dawson, staff writer for the Home News of New Brunswick, N.J., in the November 26 edition.

Mr. Dawson gives an excellent summary of questions to be answered and effects on the economy to be expected. The fuel shortage might prove a boon to some sections of the economy and a curse to others. The following article is respectfully recommended to my colleagues:

THE IMPACT

(By George B. Dawson)

The energy crisis is at once solving some of America's most pressing economic problems, but creating a host of new ones.

The managers of downtown stores, seeing a premium on motor vehicle fuel and the prospects of orders for the nighttime closing of the highway shopping centers, are practically gleeful, sensing a resurgence of the city centers which the high-energy economy of the last 25 years has tried to ignore.

Railroad stocks are up, and coal mine operators are struggling to re-open long-abandoned pits, at the same time the stock of

General Motors and the oil companies are hitting all-time lows.

Airlines are consolidating flights, and suddenly the issue of the fourth jetport for the metropolitan area, so long a bogey for northern New Jersey, becomes less real.

The economy is now going through a shake-down period perhaps unprecedented in this country since the South faced the import blockade during the Civil War.

Investments crucial to personal wealth are now risky, and a period of even higher interest rates seems in store to persuade the scared capital out of its hiding places. The result may be an even tighter clamp-down on expansion. What prospective home-buyer, remembering the difficulties his friend faced in persuading banks that he held a job of adequate promise to pay a mortgage rate of 7 and 8 percent, will enter the market when the interest rates are 10 per cent and even higher.

Growth in labor productivity, so long an unquestioned assumption of the economy, must now be questioned, since productivity growth in all but a few instances is linked directly to the amount of energy.

Growth in consumer sales, which created an advertising budget capable of supporting a \$20 billion television industry, is facing a slow-down and perhaps an absolute halt, since most new consumer products will require a new expenditure of energy which the country says it cannot supply.

Energy conservation, by these measures, becomes a radical force on the economy, compelling a thorough rewriting of a system which had placed so much on the bet that energy supplies would never be restricted.

How, then, did we come by this time of paroxysm? Did no one see the crisis coming? Did those we depend upon for advice on the economy—the bankers, the brokers of bonds and stocks, supposedly so cautious and astute that they can charge us high commissions for their services—succumb so totally to the reassurances of past experience that they developed a fatal blindness?

The earlier optimism was by no means air-tight. The Club of Rome, a business group, financed a study last year on the "limits of growth," but many had chosen to believe it wrong for the same reasons Malthus had been.

John G. Winger, a Chase Manhattan energy economist, this spring predicted chaos ahead, in a conference at Forsgate Country Club, not because of the danger that the Arabs would shut off their oil, but because of the danger we could not raise enough foreign trade money to pay for it if they did not.

"There's not a prayer of a chance that we could offset enough from the rest of our economy to offset this," Winger said in March. "And even if we could, then our energy needs will be greater just to produce the goods we'll be exporting."

"This prospect of continually accelerating growth is one, again, that I think we simply cannot face," David Moore, executive director of the North Jersey Conservation Foundation, said at the same conference.

"I find it strange to find the energy advocates desperately calling for increased exploitation of fossil reserves, when the end of the world supply of these resources is in sight."

It is by no means an uniformly cataclysmic prospect that we now face.

The house in the outer suburbs with the half-acre of lawn, the second car, the power boat, the snowmobile, the complete divorce from the problems of the cities, is no longer part of the American dream, but they haven't been anyway for so very long.

There will be more state planning, a return of the railroad and bus to vital transportation roles, a greater attempt to make do with the housing and commercial development we now have rather than perpetuation of

the automatic assumption that this development should always go in new locations.

The adjustments, however, will not come simply. Rogers C. B. Morton, Secretary of the Interior, sees a need of gasoline rationing for one or two years. Russell E. Train, Environmental Protection Agency administrator, predicts a longer period, perhaps as much as 10 years, until nuclear power and coal gasification become important enough to fill the energy gap created by growth and the loss of Arab oil.

Whatever the duration of the difficulties, their impact will be far reaching. The American economy, at their conclusion, will not be the same.

LESS WORKTIME FOR MANY CITIZENS UNDER YEAR-ROUND DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I strongly object to this legislation, H.R. 11324, which would allow our Nation to become a guinea pig for the sake of those who prefer daylight saving time. It would demand that the entire country observe year-round daylight saving time for a 2-year period so that the Department of Transportation can spend \$300,000 to see what effects its use has on our Nation.

I would rather have Congress vote to use this money to reduce the public debt, as I would gladly inform DOT what effects this legislation will have on the people of the 13th District of Texas. After hearing of the effects on these citizens, DOT would undoubtedly recommend that we return to standard time year round. Great Britain conducted an experiment of 3 years of daylight saving time, and then voted to return to standard time. Must we subject all Americans to 2 years of time change—that they do not want in many instances—to end up with the same results. The difficulties which we face in this experiment are far greater than our friends across the Atlantic faced: We must contend with the complications that arise because of the vast amount of land in each time zone and the inconveniences this places on the westernmost sections of the zones as compared with the small effect that the differences in a time zone had in Britain.

Daylight saving time is not welcomed by my people even in the summertime, and I have had numerous pleas to allow at least half of the year to be on standard time. In rural areas many school children are forced to go as far as 40 miles to school. On December 21, the Sun will not rise in Amarillo, Tex., until a few minutes before 9; these children will be forced to stand out on the highways in my district in the cold, bleak, dark morning. I am concerned for the safety of these children. Schools will need additional fuel to heat and light the classroom during this time. In homes where schoolchildren and their parents prepare for their daily activities, the fuel consumption rate will surely increase because of this later sunrise.

The impact of energy savings is to hard to rationalize in instances such as this early morning use of heat and lighting. In hearings before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Department of the Interior stated that there has been a polling of electric utility companies by the Federal Power Commission and some felt that there would not be any savings. The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association testified that "there is little evidence to suggest that much, if any, energy conservation will be achieved in rural America through year-round daylight saving time."

The committee report gave no concrete evidence that there will be any savings of fuel. Although a study was made by the Rand Corporation which estimates that over 1 percent of fuel could be saved, I have yet to talk to anyone who has seen this report, and the study itself was not available to the committee. Evidence such as was presented to the committee does not give me any reason to vote in favor of a measure for which I have received only negative correspondence.

This legislation is supported by many citizens who merely want more playtime in the evening. I cannot object to making good use of leisure time, especially in some of our sunshine States, however, in my district many farmers and ranchers work on their own property in the mornings and then must work a full day at another job in an attempt to meet their financial needs because of inflation caused by over-spending in Congress. I cannot, with good conscience, vote for legislation which will inconvenience many people who are attempting to support their families by long hours of hard work, when I cannot get reassurance that this measure will definitely save energy. I would be a poor Representative to those who elected me if I fell for this time-change gimmick. Instead of causing hardship to those hard-working Americans, perhaps we should follow the advice of two of my constituents who stated:

If our television networks would go off the air earlier, most Americans would go to bed earlier as thousands of Americans sit night after night, in overheated rooms watching the idiot box, which consumes countless kilowatts of valuable energy.

Another one of my constituents reiterated the old saying that "you can't make a blanket longer by cutting off one end and sewing it on the other end."

Not only will schoolchildren be adversely affected by this legislation, but farmers and ranchers will have no choice but to follow standard time in their schedule while the rest of the country follows a daylight savings time schedule. As one farmer so aptly put it:

You can legislate daylight savings time till you are blue in the face, but the dew is still going to dry off the field on standard time.

As housewives complain of rising food prices, it should be the concern of all my colleagues to insure that farmers can produce the needed food for America as efficiently as possible. For this, and the reasons mentioned earlier, I urge all Congressmen to vote against this legislation.

CONGRESSMAN DANIELS HAILS KENNETH LEE, X-RAY TECHNICIAN EXTRAORDINARY

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1973

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, all too often those people who do the most for the community are ignored. Their achievements are listed only in the "short and simple annals of the poor" as the poet Grey put it.

Mr. Speaker, such an unsung hero is Kenneth Lee an X-ray technician at Christ Hospital in Jersey City who has earned the gratitude of all who have come in contact with him.

Mr. Speaker, in order to honor all good Americans who go about their duties each day with a ready smile and desire to help their fellow man, I insert at this point in the RECORD a recent article by John Small published on October 30 in the Jersey Journal a powerful voice of editorial opinion in northern New Jersey. The article follows:

He's THE NEWS: AFFECTION TIES KENNETH LEE TO HIS JOB
(By John Small)

"You have to take a personal interest in the patients you work with. You have to make them feel they are wanted."

That is the attitude taken by Kenneth Lee toward his job as an X-ray technician at Jersey City's Christ Hospital.

The 26-year-old Lee is the talk of the patients at the hospital not only for his pleasant smile and friendly disposition but also for what he calls his "cheerful clothes."

Lee's trademark is a big bow tie and he wears a different one each day to match his outfit. "They have a doll down in the cardiac care unit with a big bow tie and I guess it's supposed to be me," he adds.

A lifelong Jersey resident and graduate of Dickinson High School, Lee attended Fairleigh-Dickinson University in Rutherford for two years before being drafted into the Army in 1968. He returned two years later, after having served in Germany, with plans to return to college.

Those plans were scrapped, however, when he saw an advertisement for an X-ray technician school, where he began his training in September, 1970.

He was graduated in September, 1972, and received the school's technical award. He was immediately offered positions with both Christ and Bayonne Hospitals, but took the job at Christ Hospital because he felt they "needed me more."

Lee credits much of his attitude to Anthony Apolito, another X-ray technician at the hospital. "When I first came to the hospital I saw the way Tony treated the patients and I decided to model myself after him," Lee stated.

Lee said he doesn't like to think of his work as just a regular job. "You have to put yourself in the patient's place. What if the patient were a relative or friend?"

He pointed out that most of the patients he deals with are aged or their families don't want anything to do with them. He added that he feels that because of this, the responsibility to make them feel wanted and needed, falls on his shoulder.

Lee said he has received several letters from his patients thanking him for his treatment of them. The Jersey Journal also recently received a letter from a former Christ Hos-

pital patient who commended the technician for his concern for the patients, "everyone, rich or poor."

The letter continues, "Often those most deserving or praise for their diligence and preservation are left unnoticed when success is achieved in helping the aged and the sick."

The writer adds that he "and many others" would like to see the young technician receive the recognition which they feel he deserves.

And yet the subject of these letters, the X-ray technician with the big bow tie and a "hello" for everyone feels that the letters themselves are all the recognition he needs.

TRIBUTE TO TOM PELLY

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1973

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly saddened by the sudden death of our former colleague from Washington State's First Congressional District, the Honorable Thomas Pelly and I want to extend my deepest sympathy to his wife, his family, and his loved ones at this very difficult time of loss and sorrow.

When Tom retired from Congress, after a dedicated and distinguished 20 years of service to his district, our State and Nation as a whole, he wrote to his Washington State colleagues about how much he looked forward to spending his retirement years in "God's Country"—as those of us from the Pacific Northwest fondly refer to our area of the country. Each of us felt a special envy, despite our commitment to our work here, because of our love for this land and its people and our frustration at being able to return so seldom. He would have used those years well as he used his years in the House of Representatives well. He deserved a long, fulfilling retirement life and received but a very short one.

Although my service in the Congress coincided with his for only 2 years, I was well aware of his efforts and service for years before my election and know well of the respect accorded him by the rest of the Washington State delegation. He was a man of integrity who acted on his convictions. As ranking minority member of the full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, he established an excellent record of distinguished legislative work as is evidenced by the fine compliments he has received from his fellow committee members.

He was one of the pioneer members of the Science and Astronautics Committee and his fine contributions to that committee's efforts are both well remembered and deeply appreciated by all of us serving on that committee.

Whenever we disagreed with him on specific issues or positions, we never lost sense of our admiration for the man. We were richer for his presence in the Congress and are poorer for his untimely death.